FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 166

27 August 1981

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/SALT/MBFR

Roundtable Discussion on Neutron Bomb Decision [Fesunenko, Zagladin, Zhurkin] AA 1
Arbatov Sees Neutron Bomb as Offensive Weapon [Bonn VORWAERTS] AA 10
Weinberger Seen as 'Lying' About Bomb Opposition [Gerasimov in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA] AA 11
Zhukov on Reaction to Neutron Bomb Decision [PRAVDA 21 Aug] AA 11
Academician Chazov on Dangers of Nuclear War [PRAVDA 13 Aug] AA 14
NATO Generals' Book Calling for Peace Reviewed [Vorontsov in PRAVDA 7 Aug] AA 15

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

U.S. 'Obstruction' at LOS Conference Causes Delay [Dragunov] CC 1
Soviet Delegate 'Dissatisfied' CC 1

UNITED STATES & CANADA

TASS Cites U.S. Columnist Anderson on CIA 'Plans' A 1
'Plan' for Al-Qadhdhafi A 1

CHINA

PRC Hopes to Foment NATO-Warsaw Pact Conflict B 1
'Provocative' PRC Policy in Southeast Asia Scored [Barakhta in PRAVDA 19 Aug] B 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

Japanese Defense 'White Book' Recommendations Hit [Vdovin in PRAVDA 18 Aug] C 1
Japanese Claims to 'Northern Territories' Rebuffed [Demchenko in IZVESTIYA 25 Aug] C 1
Afonin Views State of Japanese-Soviet Relations C 2

SOUTH ASIA

U.S., UK Spurn Afghan Proposals for Talks D 1
DRA Party Chairman Cited on Afghan Proposals D 1
Brezhnev, Tikhonov Greet DRA Leaders on Holiday [PRAVDA 19 Aug] D 1
IZVESTIYA Views Situation in Herat Province [Rostarchuk, 21 Aug] D 2
U.S. Aid to Pakistan Causing 'Serious Disquiet' D 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Message, Celebration Mark Romanian Liberation Day F 1
Brezhnev, Tikhonov Greeting [PRAVDA 23 Aug] F 1
Moscow Meeting Held [PRAVDA 21 Aug] F 1
Tikhonov, Verdet Address Exhibition Opening F 2
Tikhonov Speech [PRAVDA 22 Aug] F 2
Verdet Address [PRAVDA 22 Aug] F 3
RCP Delegation Tours Lithuania, Visits Farms F 5
'Extremist' Solidarity Leader Rulewski Criticized F 5
Bulgarian Official Views Leading Role of BCP F 6
[Kubadinski in PRAVDA 20 Aug]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Commentary Views Israeli-Egyptian Negotiations [Ostalskiy] H 1
As-Sadat-Begin Meeting Seen as 'Conspiracy' Step H 1
As-Sadat Offers to Be 'U.S. Gendarme' in Region H 2
[PRAVDA 19 Aug]
Brezhnev, As-Sadat Exchange Anniversary Messages H 2
PRAVDA Reports on Ethiopian-Libyan Communique [19 Aug] H 2

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Statement, Reports on South Africa-Angola Conflict J 1
TASS Statement J 1
Angolan Message to Castro J 1
U.S.-South African 'Alliance' [Kulik] J 2
'War' Possible [Lizun] J 3
Kuznetsov Receives Zairian Parliamentarians 20 Aug [IZVESTIYA 22 Aug] J 4
Briefs: Aid to Equatorial Guinea J 4

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Cuban Foreign Minister Pays 2-Day Visit to Moscow [Havana] K 1
Mexico's Echeverria Concludes Visit to Moscow [NOTIMEX] K 1
CPSU Official Leaves for Guyana Party Congress [PRAVDA 20 Aug] K 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Dolgikh, Zimyanin Attend Media Leaders Conference R 1
Report on Shevardnadze Interview on Morality R 1
Ukrainian Literature Magazine To Be Published R 3

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

CSA Reviews Fodder Procurement Statistics T 1
[Glinka in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 21 Aug]
Radio Reports Agricultural Developments for 26 Aug T 3

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION ON NEUTRON BOMB DECISION

LD262002 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 26 Aug 81

[Roundtable discussion program presented by political observer I.S. Fesunenko; Prof Vadim Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, and Prof Vitaliy Zhurkin, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] [Fesunenko] Good day comrades. The subject of the roundtable discussion which we are now beginning is the neutron bomb--the plot against humanity. Allow me first of all to introduce participants in this discussion: Prof Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department and Prof Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences. I think there is no need to give reasons for the actuality and importance of this subject. You all know comrades that the recent decision of the American administration on the beginning of large-scale production of neutron weapons has aroused truly large-scale indignation in the entire world, and a strong and dialy growing wave of protest in all the countries of the world, and primarily of course, on the European Continent. It is not at all possible to list even briefly the declarations and statements by prominent state, public and political leaders on the subject. It is not possible to tell about statements by political, public, trade union, youth, international and national organizations that you read about every day in the press and that you hear in radio braodcasts and in our television commentaries. So today we shall talk about what worries the entire world. We would like to begin this talk, this discussion, with a reminder about neutron weapons and their basic characteristics, and in what way these weapons differ from other mass destruction weapons and especially from ordinary atomic bombs. Vitaliy Vladimirovich, it is the nature of your job to deal with these problems in great depth and I would like you to begin our discussion.

[Zhurkin] Well, neutron weapons essentially belong to the third type of nuclear weapons we know. Up to now humanity had to contend with two types of nuclear weapons, atomic weapons which are based on the principle of nuclear fission, and the hydrogen or thermonuclear weapons which are based on the principle of nuclear fusion. Hydrogen weapons are traditionally much more powerful than atomic weapons. Neturon weapons are a kind of combination of the two. It is the combination of a miniature, hydrogen bomb or hydrogen device with elements of the atomic bomb, also of small size. The specific characteristic of neutron weapons is that they affect people in a slightly different manner than ordinary nuclear weapons, especially when compared with atomic bombs. It is known that the power of nuclear weapons is felt in four ways: the shock wave; the heat wave, or heat radiation sometimes called light radiation; penetrating radiation; and immediate radioactive contamination and radioactive pollution in radioactive fallout. The characteristic of the atomic bomb is that almost all its power is manifested in three ways: the shock, the heat wave, and subsequent radioactive contamination. Penetrating radiation, mostly a beam of neutrons, kills people in an especially agonizing manner, a very cruel manner. This penetrating radiation represents something like 5-6 percent of the power of the atomic bomb. In the neutron bomb or in the neutron warhead, 30 and maybe even 40 percent of its power is represented by this penetrating radiation. This is why it happens that neutron weapons kill people while leaving various structures, to a great degree intact, and this is why we speak about neutron weapons as offensive weapons because the aggressors after firing neutron shells into a certain area, kill the defenders of that region, kill a large number of the civilian population, while roads, airports, fuel dumps and some other structures remain intact.

In addition, there is another characteristic of the neutron weapons: Radioactive contamination of the area after a neutron blast is considerably smaller. It is traditionally considered, and is in fact possible, that this blast is several times smaller than an ordinary atomic blast. This means that a region hit by neutron weapons will be much safer for the aggressor troops. Finally there is another characteristic. Neutron shells are relatively small. They will be used according to the plans of the Americans both in Lance missiles and 8-inch howitzers, and have a force of between several hundred tons of TNT up to approximately two kilotons. These will be small charges. This means that for the field commander it will be easier to make a decision on the use of this weapon, and that means that the most terrible thing will happen in Europe that can happen in the course of a conflict: the lowering of the nuclear threshold. The transition from the use of conventional weapons to nuclear weapons will be made easier. In essence that means that transition to a nuclear war, which can fairly quickly become a global nuclear conflict, will be made easier.

[Fesunenko] I think it is appropriate to recall that August of this year was not the first time the world has heard about neutron weapons. We remember that at the end of the 70's President Carter attempted to impose neutron weapons on his European allies. However, at that time this idea was not realized. Maybe Vadim Valentinovich will review briefly the history of the affair.

[Zagladin] The history is very simple. In about the middle of 1977 the preliminary studies and tests were concluded which possibly preceded the beginning of the production of this weapon. Actually separate elements had to be produced which could to be later assembled, either in shells for that 8-inch howitzer which Vitaliy Vladimirovich has mentioned or in Lance missiles and both of which are now deployed in Europe and are available there in sufficiently large numbers.

Then there developed a large-scale campaign in Europe, immediately after it learned about the development, about Carter intending to make a decision on the production and the introduction of this weapon. This campaign was started simultaneously by different social forces, the communists especially played a great role. Then exactly 4 years ago, in August 1977, on the initiative of the German Communist Party an appeal was published by all the communist parties of countries which had signed the Helsinki agreements, the Final Act, and which reflected the angry indignation about a possible decision on the neutron bomb. The appeal included a protest and, of course, a call to struggle. The struggle proceeded well and the protest became so strong and powerful that Carter was forced to announce that he was postponing, for a certain period, making a decision on the production of the neutron weapons and that subsequently there was to be an announcement if the decision was adopted. I would like to dwell a little on this moment of history in order to say that both Carter's line then, and all the subsequent lines, was a line of complete deceit because now there is reliable information that though he announced the postponement of his decision, sometime in the middle of October 1978, the production of separate elements was actually begun, including the V-70 warheads for Lance missiles and V-79 warheads for 8-inch howitzers. These elements were stored separately in order to assemble them at a later date. Actually this poses no problem at all. Now it is announced that the President had adopted a decision when actually this is not really correct: It was not a decision for production because production was already in progress. The decision was about assembling the components. Now begins the question about the great lie number two. Lie number one was that they had not given up production...

[Zhurkin] Vadim Valentinovich, I remember that there was a lie from the very beginning. The first allocations for the production of neutron warheads were called allocations for public works to improve the water supply and the supply of electricity to the population, and appeared in the 1977 fiscal year.

[Zagladin] Yes. it is very true. So it was from the very beginning that everything started and was continued. So lie number two consists of the following: The President announced that the decision was apparently made with the agreement of the allies. However, the allies themselves denied this and announced that they had been informed at a later date than when the decision had been made, and that no one was consulted. Now not only the press but also European statesmen ask the question: We beg your pardon but we have a Nuclear Planning Committee--what is the purpose of its existence if such decisions are not made within the committee, but completely independently? Then there is lie number three connected with this weapon. They say "do not worry it will be stored in the United States." Then, so to speak, there is a flood of derisive commentaries in European newspapers which write: Excuse us, you say that this weapon is needed for protection against tanks; against whose tanks does the United States and Washington have to protect itself? Against Mexican or Canadian tanks, as there are no other tanks nearby?

Well, this is on the whole refuted by the Americans themselves, like Weinberger and others, who say that they are designed for Europe. Elements of neutron weapons are already in Europe. It is simply that no one knows. There are American depots, but no one informs anyone about what is in those depots.

[Zhurkin] It is impossible to monitor them because these are comparatively small shells which are kept at American depots. The Americans, who in the process of various talks on arms limitation have constantly been kicking up a row about arms controls and about the fact that there needs to be control, have adopted a decision which, on the whole, effectively excludes any control.

[Fesunenko] In preparing for our meeting I have collected a few statements made in the West which are very intriguing from this point of view, concerning the storing and the possibility of contraband deployment of this weapon in Europe. First, I will mention an article by Samuel Cohen, one of the fathers of the neutron bomb, in the French newspaper LE MONDE. While recognizing that if the Europeans do not want to have this weapon on their territory it will not be possible to ignore the fact, Cohen noted that this problem also has a purely American aspect. As he said, we maintain over 200,000 soldiers on the territory of the FRG who protect that country and the President of the United States, as commander in chief, has the right to make the decision concerning arming his forces with a weapon which will guarantee their security in the event of aggression from the Soviet Union or the countries of the Warsaw Pact. He bluntly admitted it.

Then 2 days later a correspondent of the West German weekly ZEIT, interviewing Egon Bahr, that leading figure in the German Social Democractic Party and member of the leadership of that party and chairman of the FRG Bundestag Committee on Disarmament and Arms Control, asked him: Could it happen that the Americans will introduce neutron weapons just to their own arsenal in the FRG but will not arm their allies' armies with them? Bahr, who on the whole came out against neutron weapons, replied: Legally and theoretically that is possible. It is legally possible on the basis of the treaty on the deployment of forces, and it is theoretically impossible because the Americans can unload them on their own airfields which they control without letting anyone know.

Finally I will quote from the New York TIMES of 18 August, in which there was an article which said, without beating about the bush: The announcement that these weapons will be stored only in the United States is a kind of diplomatic trick. If these weapons are at some time deployed on the front line, then it will be in Germany.

[Zagladin] Even the New York TIMES printed the following--and I have the quote before me: The uniqueness of the neutron bomb consists in the fact that it is essentially a weapon which can prove useful only in Europe.

This is evidently also a lie, because there are already reports that both medium-range missiles, cruise missiles and neutron weapons may be deployed in other places, too, for example in Japan. Thus the field is widening, and it is not only Europe that may find itself in the sights.

[Fesunenko] Well, we recall that in recent months the United States has been experiencing certain difficulties in its relations with its West European allies in connection with its determination to impose on Europe the deployment of so-called Eurostrategic missiles or theater missiles. A wave of indignation and protests has grown up and big problems have arisen in connection with this in the FRG, in particular, and in other countries including the Netherlands, Belgium, and so on. Suddenly, instead of helping its allies, as would have seemed logical, to drag through the decision, the United States is right now throwing this hot potato, so to speak, into their hands.

I would like to ask you, comrades, what you think. What caused the fact that this decision has been made at what would seem such an inconvenient and inappropriate moment? Vitaliy Vladimirovich...

[Zhurkin] Well, on the whole the moment which has been chosen is indeed puzzling. Why now? It seems to me that there are several reasons. One reason, it seems to me, is the state of a certain euphoria, some sor of feeling that everything is permissible, which has developed in certain members and en in the leadership of the present administration. There are indeed certain p tical successes. They have made their allies stand to attention in Ottawa and in general have pushed through their decisions. They have essentially suppressed a fairly major strike, and they have dragged some exceptionally reactionary legislation through Congress, and rapidly and quite energetically at that. In this situation it is possible that they have gotten dizzy and have gotten the sensation that for the United States everything is allowed, that they can permit everything, and this is of course a dangerous sensation. This sensation may lead to many unpleasant things for the present leaders of the United STates.

Then I think it was simply working spontaneously and routinely. After Carter's decision they continued to make the component parts of these neutron warheads. And another thing I wanted to say; it seems to me that this decision affects not only those five allies of the United States which are affected by the decision to deploy medium-range missiles, because although the Lance missiles are located in these same five countries, the FRG, Britain, Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands, a whole range of countries, for example, have the howitzers which can be equipped with American nuclear shells. Judging by the reports so far, Greece has these howitzers, and Turkey and Denmark also have them. That is, this nuclear buildup in Europe will tend to spread, and this intensifies the dangerous nat re of the given decision.

[Zagladin] I would like to agree with these reasons. I think that they indeed explain why this decision, and the adoption of this decision, has emerged at this time. Perhaps there is something else in addition. The first reason which Vitaliy Vladimirovich mentioned was a new demonstration of the course of pressure, the course of imposing their own policy on others, that is, in a nutshell, the attempt...

[Zhurkin interrupts] To prove that we can do anything to anyone we like. For us there is no difference, ally or no ally, enemy or no enemy. We impose our will on anyone, on whoever we wish, and we show that we shall do what we like. This is, of course, very important, and it characterizes the whole line of the present administration. It is known that up to now there have been many arguments about whether it has been defined or not; whether there is or is not a policy.

Well, there is a policy and it is being implemented, and whatever additional details have not yet been added on one side or the other, this impudence is present as the main method. Surely this is shown by, say, that shooting down of two Libyan planes last week, and so on. It is all the same. I think that this desire to impose their own will without taking any notice of anything or anyone had to be demonstrated now. Why? Because there are important things ahead; there is the session of the UN General Assembly. It will be starting soon. There are the next talks in the NATO Alliance, where it will be necessary to put pressure, too, on the allies. And in these circumstances the administration has evidently decided to show again that we, so to speak, will act without taking any notice of anything.

Another point. This neutron decision is, of course, not an isolated decision. It, of course, forms part of the general complex of the American line in the field of arms as a whole. The line is well known. It was described accurately enough by the 26th congress of our party. As we can see now almost half a year has passed and it was described very accurately. It is a line of trying to regain the lost ground and on the military level trying to regain the lost military superiority. And here one component complements another component: the decision concerning giving up SALT, or at any rate effectively giving up SALT II and the procrastination in settling the question of further talks, whatever they might be, in the field of strategic arms; then the second element, the Brussels decision of December 1979 on medium-range missiles in Europe, the time for implementation of which is approaching, and to which opposition is growing all the time; and the third component, [he corrects himself] this opposition I mean in Europe, of course, and the third component now, is the neutron decision. And it seems to me that in putting forward this new component right now, the administration has decided to demonstrate that its claims to superiority embrace all spheres, that is, I repeat, strategic, medium-range and tactical weapons, and secondly perhaps--this is perhaps as a hypothesis--to distract attention somewhat, to break the wave of protest against the medium-range missiles, against the Pershing-II and cruise missiles, which has indeed reached a colossal stage in Europe. The Americans have really begun to get worried about the fate of the Brussels decision in the sense of whether it is possible that it will be implemented or not in the final analysis. This sudden, unexpected decision on the neutron bomb while still in the vacation season, it should be added, is supposed to disperse this opposition and divert attention to some new object.

[Fesunenko] The reaction to this decision of the U.S. administration varied. On the one hand, of course, world public opinion raised a storm of protest, and is continuing to protest. The protests are continuing to swell.

As far as the European allies of the United States are concerned, their behavior varied and is varying. In some cases they are refraining from comment. Some are protesting and others agreeing. Some are saying: "This is an internal matter for the United States. This does not concern us."

[Zhurkin] Indeed there is quite a wide variety of attitudes to this neutron decision of the U.S. administration. A whole series of governments have distinctly and clearly declared that they are against this decision. Statements were issued by leaders in Norway, Denmark, Sweden and a number of other countries. Leading circles in such countries as, say, the FRG found themselves on the whole in an awkward situation, because the Reagan administration has put them in an impasse and has presented them with a fait accompli. At the same time, they also had to try to save face somehow and to try to explain somehow what had happened to their population.

So, they chose that formula, that this decision supposedly concerns only the United States. And so it was that a whole series of governments found themselves in such an ambiguous situation. It is characteristic that even those governments which have on the whole aligned themselves behind the U.S. policy of deploying medium-range missiles in Europe are experiencing embarrassment and, on the whole, they are kind of maneuvering. Admittedly, from my point of view they are maneuvering in the wrong direction. They are maneuvering in a direction to somehow protect the United States and to somehow reduce the intensity of the struggle, the struggle against this decision.

In this connection it seems to me personally that if the United States and Washington had hoped by its neutron decision to somehow lessen the intensity of the struggle against other military measures which are even more significant militarily, I think, this trick has not worked for Washington. This is because--just look--the peoples of Europe are not only coming out against the neutron decision. They are persistently stressing that this decision is closely bound up with the December 1979 NATO decision about medium-range missiles and that these are elements of one and the same thing.

[Fesunenko] Vadim Valentinovich.

[Zagladin] Yes.

[Fesunenko] I would like to ask you the following question. In the course of these polemics about the deployment, the nondeployment, the deployment after consultations, and the storage in the United States, it is the FRG which is mentioned most often for some reason as the most likely place for the deployment of these weapons. To judge by the press, this decision has indeed caused very great headaches for Bonn and the coalition of Free Democrats and Social Democrats. Very important figures in the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] have expressed opposition to this decision of the U.S. administration. They include Bahr himself, Wischnewski and so on. Please, could you comment on the way relations between, say, the United States and the FRG might look now following the adoption of this decision?

[Zagladin] You know, this is difficult to say because, on the one hand, there is a large element of embarrassment, about which you, Vitaliy Vladimirovich, have already spoken. The FRG Government feels very uncomfortable. On the other hand, the FRG has, after all, since the very beginning of the medium-range missiles business played a very active role, in fact the role of engineer, or one of the engineers, of this decision. It has thereby indirectly encouraged the U.S. administration to make other decisions of the same kind.

[Fesunenko interrupting] Incidentally, excuse me.

[Zagladin interrupting] I wonder.

[Fesunenko] In 1978 Schmidt agreed in principle to the deployment of neutron weapons on FRG territory. But now this kind of open consent is not being heard. It is being said that this is an internal matter for the United States and that we will think further on it and so on. The press is noting that there is here some...

[Zagladin interrupting] ... difference.

[Fesunenko] .... difference in positions.

[Zagladin] There is a difference. To what you have said, Igor Sergeyevich, I would just like to add that the FRG Government in fact agreed to medium-range weapons long before 1978 or 1979.

Back in 1975 they came to the conclusion that it was necessary to modernize, so to speak, the medium-range weapons and in this connection they spoke about missiles. There is in fact evidence that even earlier the FRG had negotiated with the United States on the subject of these medium-range missiles and also played the role of one of the initiators. So, perhaps history will reveal a lot more about this later on.

But if you take these medium-range missiles and the neutron weapons, there is indeed a difference in positions, although military circles--rightwing military circles--and the Christian Democratic Union, Christian Social Union circles are now saying outright that it is absolutely necessary to have these weapons. Furthermore, you yourself have already cited that quotation about the Americans of course having the right to arm their army in the FRG with whatever they want. So, on the one hand, there is embarrassment, but on the other hand, there is no direct refusal, is there? And this is very alarming, one has to say.

But I would like to go beyond a direct answer to just this question. In putting your question, you were really raising another big problem. At the beginning we already asked why this decision was made specifically at this time. In this connection we have already cited some of the calculations and motives behind the making of this decision. The first motive was to demonstrate U.S. independence, so to speak, of the allies, and their determination to impose their wishes. In the second place, this is a new step toward achieving what they consider to be military superiority. Evidently there were other motives. I do not know whether you agree with me. But I think that an important motive of this kind was the following: By using the neutron weapons in peacetime to impose another twist of the arms race in Europe, which will be the inevitable consequence, they want to try to put further pressure on the socialist countries, above all the Soviet Union, in order to force them to join in this arms race and to test once again the economic potential of socialism. But, on the other hand, they want to put pressure in exactly the same way on their allies, too. It is absolutely no coincidence, after all, that in parallel with this decision about the neutron bomb and all this talk about medium-range weapons, the Americans are now trying very persistently, very doggedly, to get their allies to meet their commitments, to increase their military budgets by the amount that was agreed or by even more.

[Fesunenko] The allies are resisting this.

[Zagladin] The allies are resisting this. So, it seems to me, this decision on the neutron bomb, one of the reasons for it, is the wish to put pressure on their allies. From what point of view? Just to get them to arm themselves? No. Another reason, in particular, is to weaken them a little economically. After all, it is no coincidence that all these events are taking place at a time when purely economic contradictions--interimperialist contradictions as we call them in our Marxist language--have reached a very high stage of aggravation. Basically, the big seven did not agree on anything in Ottawa.

The further matters go now, the more indignation there is at the high interest rates in the United States, at their trade policy and their policy of arm-twisting over military budgets. In other words, there is a need to diminish this opposition. It may be that this business with the neutron bomb, the pressure over the neutron bomb and medium-range weapons, all pursues that aim, too.

But if one is to speak of more distant things, of contingency plans for war, the U.S. administration is certainly not ruling out such possibilities. On the contrary, Vitaliy Vladimirovich has already said that one of the functions of introducing the neutron bomb is to reduce the threshold of nuclear war, in other words (?a perceptible) reduction of the threshold. Basically this means seeking recognition of the possibility, the acceptability of nuclear war.

In case war comes about, the plan is simple. It is contained in the presidential directive of (?4) August 1977. This envisages the transfer of the confrontation to a regional context since a global confrontation with the Soviet Union is dangerous. A global war will cause too many casualties. Transferring the confrontation to a regional context means transferring it to Europe or Asia or Japan or wherever and transferring the war to the territory of its allies.

I think that the Europeans are very well aware of this. At the end of last week, for example, I met Erhard Eppler, an SPD politician. He told me about the situation, about how things are going in the FRG. He did indeed speak about a certain psychological change that is taking place in people. They have suddenly begun to realize that they are faced with a question of life or death, that these decisions and all this talk about the neutron bomb, the Pershings and cruise missiles all directly concern the peoples' very lives.

[Zhurkin] It seems to me that one can also say that yet another calculation is also unjustified. This is the very plain intention of achieving nuclear or other military superiority.

[Fesunenko] Unquestionably.

[Zhurkin] If the Soviet Union, when it was weaker economically, could parry all these moves and did not allow itself to be overtaken in the imposed arms race, then in present circumstances, it is all the more unlikely. Naturally, taking part in this race is not easy. It demands great efforts and economically it is no easy task. But for any state and for our state, it is a matter of war and peace, an important matter, a fundamental question and sooner or later, in Washington they must understand that to break the established parity--be it in the strategic field or parity in Europe--the United States will not succeed.

[Zagladin] I think that they still entertain such hopes and these hopes are based in particular on that wrong and deeply erroneous picture of our country--its possibilities, the potentials of our system--which the Americans always had. It is an interesting thing, if you take all the forecasts, American or other Western forecasts about the Soviet Union, socialism and its potential, beginning with the year 1917. I will not quote the often-repeated and well-known facts about how many times they forecast the fall of the Soviet regime; that is a well-known thing. Let us remember facts which are closer to us, for instance the postwar period. Such as how many years the Soviet Union will need for the reconstruction of the national economy. They quoted all kinds of double figures, decades [sentence interrupted]

[Zhurkin] Including the year 1981.

[Zagladin] Including the year 1981; that is very true. But what was achieved in 1947-1949 considerably surpassed the prewar level. Then the question was when will Russia have a nuclear bomb. I remember a pamphlet published by the Americans, and again they mentioned all kinds of double figures, but you know that in 1949 neither the atomic nor the hydrogen bomb was a secret. And so on and so forth, we can quote masses of such forecasts. Now we have the same thing. They think that the Russians will not manage--they do not understand either the potentials of our country, or the attitude of the people on these problems.

[Fesunenko] It is interesting that in this aspect the current American administration has a very authoritative opponent, Richard Nixon. I will remind you that on taking power in 1969, he was forced to admit that the strategic arsenals of the United States and the USSR had become generally and totally equal and stated plainly that before the superiority of the United States over the Soviet Union, in aggregate nuclear potential was at least four to one, or maybe a five to one ratio--we will not talk now about the accuracy of these figures, that is not the question. Further, Nixon said: Things are different now, the gap no longer exists and it will never exist. That is what Nixon said in 1969.

Now I would like to pass on to the last question of our discussion. If Washington, despite commonsense and counter to the elements, pushes through with this decision to introduce the use of neutron weapons, will push them through into Europe and force the allies to arm themselves with these weapons, what conclusions must our country make?

[Zagladin] I think that this is not really a question because the conclusions we are making and will continue to make are generally clear and about them much was already clearly stated. It may be worthwhile to state first of all the following general statement, that the fight about neutron weapons, and more widely about the entire complex problem of rearmament, the problem of correlation of forces, reflects now in a most vivid manner the two international policy lines about which we always talk, and which were dealt with at our congress. Two lines, one of which is peace, or peaceful coexistence, relaxation of tension, and the other line is a line of increasing tension, of a completely unrealistic task of attaining military superiority over socialism which is advocated first of all by the United States. As to the first line, our line, that is actually our response. It is the line of the 26th CPSU Congress. The proposals of the congress are well known to our television viewers but I would like to remind you about something else, that after the congress--during the few months which have since elapsed, our country and Leonid Ilich Brezhnev on behalf of our country came out with a large number of proposals on practically all the key problems in the current international situation. That is our reply, a reply which shows that we do not give in to blackmail, that we continue to pursue our constructive line. They say that we are trying to impose our policy on others. Yes, if you like, but within just one aspect; we want to impose peace, impose our will for peace to our--I do not want to say--enemies. I would like to say our opponents, opponents and at the same time partners, because the United States remains the largest state in the Western world we have to deal with, and impose on it our will for peace, our will for talks.

From this point of view, the most important step in the last few months was the appeal of the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted on 23 June, the main content of which is: Let us sit at a conference table; there is no alternative to talks. This may be our most important reply. Why? Because we have grounds for optimism, I think. I don't know what you think. Those grounds are our potential economic, military, in fact every possibility to prevent any kind of superiority to anyone. Second, the united position of the socialist countries. Then there is the support which we receive from the widest circles of the public in this aspect.

We already talked about that. Fourth, it is the position of a growing number of governments or statesmen who do not want to follow the road to war at all. We and they may have different views on this or that problem, but none of us wants war, neither they nor we, and this I think is quite sufficient for optimism.

[Fesunenko] Without a doubt. I would like, Vadim Valentinovich to complete your thought about the fact that we persistently offer, continue this policy of dialogue--insisting on the continuation of a policy of peaceful coexistence--with a quotation from an address by Comrade Brezhnev to the readers of SOVIET LIFE magazine: We have many times emphasized, publicly as well, that we do not seek confrontation with the United States, and are not attempting to encroach on the vital interests of your country, of the United States. The Soviet Union wants peace, cooperation, and normal relations based on mutual trust between our countries. For this reason we offer to the United States honest and constructive talks, a search for mutually acceptable decisions on practically all the major problems existing between us.

With this thought, with this quotation, this statement of Comrade Brezhnev, I would like to end our roundtable discussion, and thank the comrades who have taken part in the discussion, and thank the television viewers for the attention with which we hope this broadcast was watched. Goodbye, comrades.

ARBATOV SEES NEUTRON BOMB AS OFFENSIVE WEAPON

LD261258 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 26 Aug 81

[Report on an article in the West German weekly VORWAERTS by Georgiy Arbatov, prominent Soviet expert on the United States and Canada, on President Reagan's decision on neutron weapons.

[Text] The decision to produce the neutron bomb by far does not promote peace, Professor Arbatov points out. I don't want loud words but the very idea of this weapon stems from a desire to make a nuclear bomb useable in practical terms, useable even in conditions of overpopulated and closely built-in Europe. The decision to start full-scale production of the neutron bomb proceeds from a design to make a nuclear war a tangible possibility. Another objective is to demonstrate to the Soviet Union and all the world that Washington, if need be, would not shrink from a war like that. No talk about containing Soviet tanks can disguise this truth. All the more so since Western Europe has been saturated with something like 200,000 or even perhaps 300,000 units of most up-to-date antitank weapons.

The version about the neutron bomb being a defensive weapon is a downright lie and it ought to be shameful to repeat this lie over and over again. The neutron bomb is less defensive than any other nuclear weapon. If a neutron charge or bomb can be used against tanks in the same manner they are set against defensive structures. They are likewise good for keeping the streets clear of rubble and ruins, for advancing armies after the defenders and civilians have been killed. In a word, Professor Georgiy Arbatov went on to say, the neutron bomb is as much as an offensive weapon; this is the weapon of aggression devised not only for making threats but also for probable use. That's why Moscow regards as flimsy, attempts by some zealous friends of them to vindicate American behavior by claiming the neutron decision was America's internal affair and while the neutron bomb is stockpiled in the United States the matter does not concern its allies.

But this matter involves a weapon devised for nuclear warfare to be waged on the territory of the Allies, first and foremost on the territory of the United States' European allies. So how come does the matter not concern them? Furthermore, the Soviet Union, against whom this weapon is meant, will possibly find it necessary to take additional steps to safeguard its defense on the European theater. Again, this issue concerns both the United States and its allies as well. Finally, a question may arise pertaining to verification, to checks on whether the neutron bomb has been brought to Europe or not. Or perhaps the Americans want their allies to take them at their word. As a matter of fact the neutron weapon cannot be put to use against the Soviet Union from United States territory. So it makes no sense to produce it for stationing on the other side of the ocean.

And there is another important consideration. Many are asking as to how the neutron decision will affect talks on medium-range missiles in Europe, provided the talks get underway, as it is believed, at the end of the year. In this sense I can only say that the decision to produce the neutron bomb has confirmed the impression, and we in Moscow felt it before, that so far the American administration does not intend to negotiate in good faith on the issue of arms limitation of any arms including medium-range weapons. On the contrary, the United States has embarked on accelerating the arms race and fanning tension. The air is rank with powder to an ever greater extent. The American statements on the intention to start talks in the short-term future look against the background of the Washington policy as an attempt to hoodwink the public. The neutron decision makes it abundantly clear.

WEINBERGER SEEN AS 'LYING' ABOUT BOMB OPPOSITION

LD270726 Moscow TASS in English 0630 GMT 27 Aug 81

["Gennadiy Gerasimov: The Truth and Lies About the Neutron Bomb"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Aug, TASS--Exposing the allegations by U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger that opposition to the neutron weapon is mainly spread by means of a well-prepared propaganda campaign orchestrated by Moscow, Gennadiy Gerasimov, political observer of the APN (the Soviet press agency) writes in the newspaper SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA:

These words ring as an insult to the Europeans and peoples of other continents, who raised their voices of protest on the basis of evaluations, which they have made themselves, and not by keeping by "Moscow's hand." Weinberger's pronouncement is a demonstration of an old and dirty trick, when an opponent is libelled and a discussion is replaced with slanders. The opponents of the neutron weapon and Moscow may have only one common wish--that to prevent a nuclear holocaust. As to the rest, they may prove to be antipodes. Who will believe the statement even if it were made by a cabinet member, that the wave of protest is sweeping Europe now in answer to the wave of the baton of the Moscow "conductor"? No, this wave has been touched off by the sinister decision of the U.S. President.

Hence it is obvious that the defence secretary was lying when he was trying to point to the "main" cause of the actions against neutron death, the observer stressed.

ZHUKOV ON REACTION TO NEUTRON BOMB DECISION

PM261409 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Aug 81 p 4

[PRAVDA political observer Yuriy Zhukov article: "Weapon of Aggression"]

[Text] Leading figures in the Washington administration and their attendant American mass media are literally bending over backward these days to advertise the neutron weapon--President Reagan gave the order for its full-scale production in the United States on 6 August.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger is making a particular effort, giving out interviews and statements right and left in praise of the neutron bomb. On 10 August, for instance, he told a West German television correspondent that "neutron warheads help to alleviate the situation and preserve peace" (?)

William Buckley, who shares his views and is a well-known obscurantist described by the New York TIMES as an "ardent supporter of conservative positions," published a panegyric in the New York DAILY NEWS on 15 August under the striking headline: "The Neutron Bomb--a Unique Antiwar (?!) Weapon." Incidentally, this article begins with this familiar compliment to the President: "Our guy Reagan really has the sober ability to live, and this is beginning to make an impression even abroad." Well, Reagan certainly made some "impression" with his decision on producing the neutron bomb. But, one wonders, what kind of impression?

Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland stated: "Our position is quite simple: We are against the production and the deployment" of neutron weapons."

The Swedish foreign minister stated: "The U.S. decision to start production of neutron weapons is yet another dangerous step in the arms race."

The Danish foreign minister said: "Denmark resolutely condemns President Reagan's decision on the production of neutron warheads."

The Dutch Government recalled that it "objects to any future deployment of neutron warheads on Dutch territory."

The Italian Government noted that "U.S. President Reagan's order to commence full-scale production of neutron weapons was taken without preliminary consultations with the governments of the allied countries."

The Belgian minister of national defense said that his government only learned of the decision 2 days after Reagan gave the order.

Even the most loyal U.S. allies--the British and FRG Governments--have by no means expressed rapture. They have confined themselves to short, vague statements to the effect that since Reagan said that the United States will keep the neutron bombs on its own territory for the time being, this is an "internal U.S. affair" and allegedly does not concern them. But meanwhile the British and West German press is in a rage against the United States.

Thus Britain's DAILY MIRROR published an editorial called "Neutron Madness" on 11 August, describing as an "absurdity" the Pentagon statement that there are allegedly "no plans to stockpile neutron bombs outside the United States." "If this weapon is ever used, it will be on German territory," the newspaper stated. The West German newspaper FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, for its part, reported that Reagan's decision "has been greeted in Bonn with barely concealed abuse. It has been taken at the wrong time and is backed by false arguments."

Embarrassment has been caused even in NATO Headquarters. As London's THE TIMES reported 10 August, NATO spokesmen, caught unawares by the news of Reagan's decision, stated that it "indicates a lack of a sound approach to relations with the European allies." This announcement," they noted, "will further exacerbate the emotional reaction of a very considerable section of the public in Europe.... This will certainly jeopardize important NATO decisions since it will strengthen still further the opposition to the deployment of American theater nuclear weapons in Europe. In the opinion of NATO official spokesmen," THE TIMES stressed, "it is not worth staking everything for the sake of the neutron bomb."

This sharp reaction by the U.S. allies to Reagan's decision is not, of course, by any means because they have suddenly learned to see clearly. The common class interests of ruling circles in capitalist countries and the tough rules of the NATO alliance still unite the members of the military bloc with the "senior partner" and discipline them. But even they are forced to maneuver today in view of the rapid growth of the peoples' struggle against the neutron bomb and the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

People in Western Europe have not forgotten that under pressure from the world public, Carter, the previous U.S. president, who also tried to deploy these weapons in Europe, was forced to withdraw in February 1978, announcing his "postponement" of a decision on this issue. And now West Germany's RUHR NACHRICHTEN warns: "It would be a mistake to suppose that the peace movement will be satisfied by Bonn's statement that Reagan's decision is an internal American affair." Another West German newspaper, WESTFALISCHE RUNDSCHAU, also stated: "It will be very difficult for the chancellor to defend America and also prevent an anti-American campaign."

What is the explanation for this rapid increase in protests against the weapon advertised by the United States as a "unique antiwar weapon"? The whole point is its nature and purpose. The falsity of its advocates' arguments is exposed by many prominent figures in Western Europe whom even patent anti-Sovietists cannot depict as "agents of the Kremlin."

Here, for instance, is what Egon Bahr, a well-known figure in the FRG Social Democratic Party, said on the radio 13 August: "Objectively speaking, when people assert that the neutron weapon is suitable exclusively for defense--that is, for defense against large tank formations--they are misleading public opinion. OF COURSE, THIS BOMB, AS A WEAPON INTENDED FOR ATTACK, IS OF INTEREST TO A POTENTIAL AGGRESSOR [capitalized printed in boldface] (my emphasis--Yu Zh.) who, if he intends to attack, would find himself tempted to clear the battlefield of the defending side's soldiers by means of using neutron weapons...."

H. Werner, prime minister of the West German Land of Hessen, stated that "Washington is evidently reluctant to take account of the interests of the allies in Europe" and that the U.S. President's decision could entail very serious consequences for future relations between the NATO partners.

These remarks chime with the statement by the prominent Swedish politician O. Palme, chairman of the Social Democratic Labor Party of Sweden and former prime minister, who sharply criticized the U.S. President's decision in Stockholm 14 August.

"This extremely barbaric weapon," he stressed, "lowers the so-called nuclear threshold, which increases the danger of the outbreak of thermonuclear disaster. Assertions that neutron weapons will only be stockpiled on U.S. territory are a maneuver. The weapon is intended for Europe, so the question of its production affects all the European peoples."

The concern caused everywhere by the U.S. President's dangerous decision was intensified still further and extended to all continents when U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger, addressing journalists at a hurriedly convened press conference in the Pentagon 11 August, stated that neutron weapons "could be used on battlefields outside Europe." "Weinberger did not name the Persian Gulf, but other official spokesmen made it clear that the weapon is regarded as potentially effective in the sphere of rebuffing a possible sprint by enemy tank forces toward the oilfields in Iran or Saudi Arabia," the New York TIMES reported 11 August.

The unsubstantiated reference to that mythical "possible sprint by enemy tank forces" convinced nobody: Everyone knows that the Pentagon leaders have become accustomed to covering their adventures with assertions that somebody, somewhere is threatening American "national interests," which they extend to all continents. But Weinberger's assertion on the possible use of the neutron bomb "outside Europe" alarmed the developing countries.

Their alarm was increased still further when it became known that the United States plans to use its base on Diego Garcia Island in the Indian Ocean for the deployment of nuclear weapons.

Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi was quick to condemn Reagan's decision on full-scale production of the neutron weapon. Commenting on the report that the weapon will be deployed on Diego Garcia Island, the Indian paper PATRIOT angrily wrote 16 August: "The military-industrial complex, which effectively rules America, wants to use African and Asian countries as guinea-pigs to ascertain the effectiveness of the neutron weapon just as it once used Hiroshima and Nagasaki to test the atom bomb and, later, Vietnam to test other barbaric types of mass destruction weapons."

The Japanese public, which well remembers the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, reacted angrily to Weinberger's statement on the possible use of the neutron weapon. The movement demanding that the United States abandon the neutron bomb is also growing daily in other Asian, African and Latin American countries.

Antiwar movements, united around the WPC, are in the vanguard of the struggle. On 10 August the WPC published an appeal: "Oppose the U.S. neutron bomb immediately." It says: "The WPC urges all national peace committees and all people of good will in all countries to act more vigorously, purposefully and cohesively than ever before to condemn the U.S. administration's decision and demand that it is revoked forthwith. Just as public opinion said 'no' to the illegal, barbaric neutron bomb before, it can and must do the same again."

Today people must recall that in March 1978 the USSR and the other socialist countries submitted for examination by the disarmament committee in Geneva a draft international agreement banning the neutron weapon but the United States and its allies are obstructing the examination of it.

People also recall that in April 1978 Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said at the Komsomol Congress that the USSR will not start producing the neutron weapon if the United States does not produce it. The Soviet Union repeated this proposal on several subsequent occasions but Washington did not reply in the affirmative.

It is more urgent today than ever before. Peace supporters everywhere recognize this fact and are becoming increasingly vociferous in their demands that the United States abandon the barbaric, inhuman neutron weapon before it is too late and sit down at the negotiating table as soon as possible to put an end to the nuclear arms race once and for all. As the 14 August TASS statement says, "Soviet leading circles remain convinced that this solution accords best with the task of strengthening peace and would be in the interests of all states and peoples. At the same time no one should doubt that in the light of the steps being taken by the United States the Soviet Union will duly assess the developing situation and take the necessary steps to safeguard its own security and that of its friends and allies."

This gives the Washington leaders something to think about. The choice is theirs! And the choice must not be delayed.

ACADEMICIAN CHAZOV ON DANGERS OF NUCLEAR WAR

PM241516 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 13 August carries on page 4 a 2,900-word article entitled "Safeguarding Life on Earth" by Academician Ye. Chazov, chairman of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences Presidium "Medics Against Nuclear War" Committee. The author accuses "influential forces" in the West of "manipulating" the threat of nuclear war in order to secure "one-sided military advantages." Stressing the need for the world scientific and medical community to bring home to the public the full horror of a nuclear conflagration, the author cites claims by "authoritative Japanese scientists" that the official U.S. and Japanese casualty figures relating to the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are considerable understatements. Chazov describes as "laughable" claims that a limited nuclear war could be fought with the neutron bomb, supporting his view with details of how the effects of the weapon could not be confined to combatants in a nuclear scenario, especially in countries with high population densities. The article concludes with a call for the immediate commencement of "honest, equal and effective talks."

NATO GENERALS' BOOK CALLING FOR PEACE REVIEWED

PM251104 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Aug 81 p 4

[G. Vorontsov book review: "Important Testimony: On the Book 'Generals for Peace'"]

[Text] The increasing danger of war in the conditions of the deteriorating international situation is causing increasing concern to broad public circles and the peoples of countries big and small, in West and East. People want to know who is trying--and why--to erase the lessons of World War II and the "cold war" and to bury the hopes for a peaceful, stable future which gained momentum in the seventies.

There is a specific answer to that question. It was formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress. Yes, there are quite specific aggressive circles of imperialism--above all American imperialism--which have decided to reverse the wheel of history. They do not want relaxation of tension; the peoples' right to determine their own path and destinies is not to their liking. The successes of real socialism are odious to them. Seeking to camouflage their misanthropic plans for preparing a new war, these circles are trying to shift the blame for the deterioration in the international situation onto the Soviet Union and its allies. Their aim is relatively simple: They hope to convince the broad international public that the stepping up of U.S. and NATO militarist preparations and the return to a "position of strength" policy is only a quest for a counterweight to the increase in "Soviet military might," which, they say, threatens the West.

Sober voices have recently been heard increasingly frequently against the background of anti-Soviet hysteria fanned by militarist circles. Awareness of the pernicious consequences for all mankind of a nuclear confrontation is making many hitherto silent people speak out. It is noteworthy that among them are high-ranking military personnel--generals and admirals who have held leading posts in the armed forces in NATO countries. They include, in particular, West German Gen Count W. von Baudissin, who served in the highest echelons of NATO staffs; former Portuguese President Gen F. da Costa Gomes; British Brig Gen M. Harbottle; Gen G. Koumanakos, former first deputy chief of the Greek Armed Forces General Staff; American Adm J. Lee; Dutch Gen M. Van Meijenfieldt, who until 1981 headed the Royal Military Academy at Breda; Italian Gen Senator N. Paspi, who held the post of deputy supreme commander of NATO forces in Western Europe; and Adm A. Sanguinetti, former deputy chief of the French Navy Main Staff. Their statements on the problems of war and peace are collected in the book "Generals for Peace" published in Cologne (FRG) by the (Pal-Rugenshtayn) Publishing House.

We are presented with a series of interviews setting forth the opinions of competent people who know very well what nuclear weapons and other modern means of mass destruction are like, what would be the consequences of their use and how nuclear catastrophe threatens the world. Their professional experience, understanding of military matters and--particularly important--civic conscience prevented them from remaining indifferent to the threat hanging over the world.

Of course, a complete coincidence of views among them in relation to the problems examined in the book can hardly be expected. Nonetheless they are, in the main, unanimous. Above all, they are unanimous on the unacceptability of nuclear war and the really catastrophic consequences it would have for human civilization. Thus W. von Baudissin declares that in view of the existence of nuclear weapons "the military resolution of conflicts has become absurd," while Adm J. Lee believes that the use of nuclear weapons will inevitably cause a general catastrophe.

The book's authors give similar assessments of modern American concepts of "limited" nuclear war. According to M. Harbottle, "speculation about limited nuclear war is as unrealistic as it is dangerous." F. da Costa Gomes debunks the fallacious theories which are current in the West about the "possibility of using tactical nuclear weapons in a war between the blocs (he has in mind NATO and the Warsaw Pact--G.V.) without an automatic escalation of the conflict."

"The explosion of the first nuclear warhead," he goes on, "will definitely lead to a general nuclear war." Von Baudissin, describing "limited" nuclear war in Europe as impossible, regards the numerous debates on this issue as "strange."

The assessments of the Soviet Union's policy given in the book vary. However, it is noteworthy that most of those interviewed regard the "Soviet threat" as a fabrication, a lie, a deliberate falsification. "The legend of the 'danger from the East' is as old as the Soviet Union itself," Van Meijenfieldt says. "It was used to justify interventionist wars when it was necessary to find a justification for the German public for the fascist aggressive war. It is now manifested in new forms all the time." Van Meijenfieldt cites the "most grotesque forms" of this myth as examples. He recalls the loud campaign about the "missile gap" between the United States and the USSR launched in the period of J. Kennedy's administration. It is generally admitted that in reality the United States had a notable superiority at the time. Equally far from the truth, in his opinion, is the present campaign about the unilateral advantage allegedly obtained by the USSR thanks to the missiles known in the West as SS-20's.

Admiral Sanguinetti exposes a number of propaganda methods intended to fan the "Soviet threat" myth. According to his testimony, Western commentators juggle with words and mislead the public, always mentioning only a proportion of Western forces and confining themselves to mentioning those deployed in Europe and even only those east of the Rhine, while in speaking of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces they take into account those of the USSR's troops which are located deep inside Soviet territory and are intended to ensure its security against a potential threat from other regions. Thus the armed forces of Britain and Portugal are left out of the calculation, despite those countries' membership in the NATO military organization, not to mention the fact that no account is taken of the armed forces of either France or Spain, although the latter is linked to the United States by a bilateral military agreement. They are still more reticent about American troops deployed along the USSR's borde[illegible]utside Europe. The estimate of the number of Soviet tanks, which does not take acc[illegible] of the West's superiority in antitank facilities, is equally tendentious.

Equally, Sanguinetti goes on, neither the Western mass propaganda media nor NATO official figures "ever take account of real geopolitical factors"--factors such as the tremendous length of the USSR's borders, which must be defended, and also the large area of its territory, which makes it difficult to redeploy troops rapidly.

The book's assessments of the correlation of military forces are of great significance in debunking the "Soviet threat" myth. The generals acknowledge, on the whole, the existence of parity between the USSR and the United States, between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. "A certain equilibrium exists between the two military systems," Van Meijenfieldt believes, "due mainly to the strategic nuclear powers--America and Russia." The existence of "strategic stability between the great powers and their alliances" is also mentioned by Von Baudissin. "If you compare the potentials of NATO and the Warsaw Pact with regard to such important indicators as the numerical strength of troops and the quantity of nuclear weapons, it is quite impossible to reach the conclusion that the USSR and its allies have superiority over NATO," General Harbottle notes.

U.S. and NATO aggressive circles seek to wreck the existing equilibrium and achieve military superiority, gambling on an unprecedented arms race. The military experts warn of the dangers of this course. "The continuing nuclear arms race," General Harbottle says, "constantly increases the likelihood of the use of these weapons and of accidents or fatal errors involving them." Meanwhile, "the public is becoming increasingly accustomed (it would be more accurate to say that they want to accustom them--G.V.) to the idea of the possibility of limited nuclear war."

In the opinion of the book's authors the further stockpiling of arsenals of weapons of mass destruction and substantial changes in military hardware and technology could lead to really catastrophic consequences. They note the objective need for arms limitation and reduction. They all express concern in connection with the new U.S. and NATO military programs and plans.

Who is the initiator of the postwar arms race? Who is now once again setting a course of confrontation? The Van Meijenfieldt interview analyzes the history of the adoption of new types of arms in the United States and the USSR. It is clear from the data he cites that the initiator of different stages in the arms race is the United States. Van Meijenfieldt draws the logical conclusion that the Soviet Union was forced to take retaliatory steps to ensure its security. In his opinion there is great danger inherent in the fact that "trends toward a unilateral change in the correlation of military forces in favor of the United States can now again be observed." This is the aim of Washington's plans for the development and introduction of dangerous new types of arms, such as MX missiles, Trident missile-carrying submarines, neutron weapons and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

U.S. and NATO plans to deploy new American missiles in Western Europe are sharply criticized by General Koumanakos. "Under cover of a naive, false argument about the modernization of NATO armed forces, very serious, dangerous steps are being taken," he says, accusing the Pentagon of "systematic interference over the heads of the European peoples" in the continent's affairs, in its desire to change the established correlation of forces there in its own favor. "The situation in Europe has entered a new phase," Koumanakos warns with concern. "Europe is at a crossroads. One side is displaying a desire and readiness to disarmament while the other is making persistent attempts to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union."

It is with the same concern that Admiral Sanguinetti receives NATO's "missile decisions," foisted by the United States on its partners. "If West Europeans really feel the need to gain a sense of tranquillity by means of deploying new American missiles, the question should be posed: Why have the Dutch and Belgian parliaments voted against this and why have these decisions caused such concern among people in Europe?" he asks. Sanguinetti regards Washington's policy as not only selfish by cynical: "If the United States finds itself in a state of crisis, if the West's economy meets with serious problems, the destruction of Europe will only be advantageous to American industry."

This opinion is largely shared by Van Meijenfieldt. He regards as adventurist and dangerous the U.S. and NATO plans and their course of a "tremendous quantitative growth and qualitative improvement in armaments." The inclusion of Western Europe in Washington's strategic concepts assigns it a "battlefield role." Criticizing the American course of unleashing a new round in the arms race, Van Meijenfieldt notes that its orientation is becoming quite obvious in light of U.S. strategic concepts: "U.S. foreign policy strategy is aimed at regaining a position of strength and returning to the old plans for establishing world dominance for the United States as the world's gendarme, regarding nuclear threats and blackmail and--if necessary--gunboat diplomacy as a legitimate means of ensuring its own political and economic interests." But the peoples of Western Europe are reluctant to be hostages to the Pentagon's "nuclear strategists." "Europe must act on the basis of its own interests," Van Meijenfieldt asserts.

The authoritative testimonies of military experts convincingly confirm the truth about the present correlation of military forces in the world and about precisely who is seeking to violate the established military equilibrium and is thereby moving toward the stepping up of military tension.

What way out of the present tense international situation do the generals who wrote the book see? Summing up the interviews, it may be said that they see as the only reasonable path that of strengthening peace, reducing arms, and preserving and developing of detente and East-West talks.

The book "Generals for Peace" confirms yet again that the ranks of those who come out in favor of peace and against the arms race are swelling. This is natural in the conditions of increased danger of war. "It is necessary now, today, to do everything to bar the way to those who are fond of unlimited arms and military adventures," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev has noted. "Everything must be done to ensure people's right to life. Here nobody can remain aloof or indifferent: This cause affects everyone."

U.S. 'OBSTRUCTION' AT LOS CONFERENCE CAUSES DELAY

LD252146 Moscow TASS in English 2120 GMT 25 Aug 81

[Correspondent Georgiy Dragunov report]

[Text] Geneva, 25 Aug, TASS--The tenth session of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea is marking time because of the position of the United States which presses for the revision of the draft convention that has already been agreed upon in general. Such is the opinion of political observers in the Palace of Nations where the international conference is held. The draft of the important document, the comprehensive convention of the Law of the Sea that is to regulate the use by all states of the expanses of seas and oceans and the extraction of minerals from their subsoil has been worked over almost a decade by great efforts of representatives of almost 150 countries. This work was so near completion that in August of last year the conference decided that this work be concluded in 1981 and that in the same year the convention be adopted and opened for signing. But with the coming into office of the new U.S. administration this has been threatened with disruption. As representative of the Soviet Union, USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Semen Kozyrev, stressed at the plenary meeting of the conference, the U.S. delegation assumed an obstructionist stand, seeking to drag out the work of the Conference on the Law of the Sea or to achieve the adoption of the decisions that would suit only the interests of monopolies.

These encroachments by the United States were strongly rejected by delegations of socialists states and of the "Group of 77"--developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The "Group of 77" made a statement protesting against the United States' intention to impose the decisions suiting the USA alone, to revise the fundamental provisions of the draft convention that has nearly been agreed upon and of the entire range of compromise decisions on which the draft convention is based.

But the United States delegation stubbornly continues putting obstacles to the conference. Using various ruses and making veiled threats to leave the conference, the U.S. delegation started a fruitless discussion which led to the waste of much time. It is precisely because of this that the conference had to adopt the decision to hold a new session in the spring of 1982 for concluding the talks on the draft convention and adopting it.

Soviet Delegate 'Dissatisfied'

LD252318 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 25 Aug 81

[Text] Geneva, 25 Aug, TASS--Speaking at a plenary meeting of the UN Law of the Sea Conference, Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Semen Kozyrev has said that after three weeks of its session the USSR delegation cannot express satisfaction with how things go on at the conference. Negotiations on three unsettled issues and on the final working of the convention were deliberately hampered through the guilt of the United States delegation which continued holding an obstructionist stand toward the conference. The evidence of that are also the futile discussion at the so-called "Group of 28", which was formed at the request of the U.S. delegation. That group did not help celebrate the work of the conference, but, on the contrary, hampered its work. The discussion at the group reaffirmed that by its obstructionist stand the United States pursues the aim of delaying the work of the conference or thwarting it so that to get down to unilateral actions or attain such decisions on a number of the main issues pertaining to exploitation of resources of the international area of the seabed, that would meet only the interests of its national companies and imperialist transnational concerns. [sentence as received] The USSR delegation expresses the hope that the United States delegation would not continue the obstructionist line, display the spirit of cooperation and understanding of the interests of the other states and make a constructive contribution to establishment of an equitable order of using seas and their resources, which was expressed in the available draft convention.

TASS CITES U.S. COLUMNIST ANDERSON ON CIA 'PLANS'

LD262358 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT 26 Aug 81

[Text] Washington, 26 Aug, TASS--The U.S. Central Intelligence Agency has drafted a comprehensive programme for stepping up subversive and terrorist operations against sovereign countries and national liberation movements, a well-known U.S. columnist Jack Anderson writes in the Washington POST. According to him, on May 9 this year the CIA Director William Casey issued a secret directive "Draft Plan for Operations in Africa and the Middle East," providing for a sharp activisation of subversive actions. The article says that to make covert operations "efficient," the CIA is going to team up even closer with anti-communist groupings and totalitarian regimes.

Casey's directive recommends the departments of the CIA to consider the issue of rapidly stepping up aid to anti-communist forces and suggests that they coordinate covert operations with the actions of special services of the Western allies of the United States.

Jack Anderson stresses that CIA's subversive operations are above all directed against such nations, "unfriendly" to the United States, as Libya, Cuba, Angola and Iran. William Casey has no scruples about whom the CIA will entrust with such dirty work. In order to realize his plans the CIA director is ready to team up with immoral extremists, dictators and terrorists. An important role in CIA's subversive activities is entrusted to emigree groupings as well.

Analysing the methods of CIA's work, Jack Anderson recalls that it organized an armed aggression against Cuba at the Bay of Cochinos, armed members of Meo tribes and used them to combat national liberation forces in Laos. President Carter embarked on the same road in an attempt to overthrow Ayatollah Khomeyni. The article says that strategists from the CIA are planning ever new military ventures and covert operations. Jack Anderson stresses that this can open Pandora's Box and cause a series of coups around the world.

'Plan' for Al-Qadhdhafi

LD251246 Moscow TASS in English 1058 GMT 25 Aug 81

[Text] Washington, 25 Aug, TASS--With the knowledge of the White House the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency has drawn up a criminal plan of assassinating the leader of the Libyan revolution Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi. This is reported today by the well-informed columnist of the Washington POST Jack Anderson.

The CIA operation, the columnist reports, has already been drawn up in every detail. It is intended to send to Libya an assassin with a lethal poison that kills after a certain period of time. No signs of poisoning will be detected in the first 48 hours. This to be followed by a feverish state that it is difficult to distinguish from an ordinary cold. Then paralysis and death will set in. No traces of the poison will remain in the organism.

The new horrendous plot of the CIA is a direct continuation of many other criminal operations conducted by this agency and directed at staging state coups with the aim of overthrowing overseas governments, that do not suit Washington, and of killing foreign politicians. In this connection Anderson recalls the CIA's attempts to assassinate Fidel Castro and the CIA's doings in Laos and Iraq. Jack Anderson writes that the U.S. espionage establishment is now working also on other wild plots. Jack Anderson emphasises that the White House is informed of the CIA's plans. This proves that top officials of the American administration are involved in heinous terrorist plans against the leadership of the Libyan Jamahiriyah. Meantime it is these very officials who are fanning up the hypocritical campaign of "struggle against international terrorism" and accusing Libya of "supporting" terrorism. The cynicism of the present U.S. leaders really knows no bounds.

PRC HOPES TO FOMENT NATO-WARSAW PACT CONFLICT

LD261534 Moscow TASS in English 1428 GMT 26 Aug 81

[By TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Aug, TASS--Fully ignoring the peoples' aspirations, they in Beijing are continuing the campaign aimed at whitewashing Washington's policy of speeding up the arms race and even lending a fresh impetus to it. Hardly a day passes by without China's propaganda organs, primarily the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO and the XINHUA news agency, coming out this way or other in defence of the decision by the American administration on full-scale production of neutron weapons, in support of deployment on the territory of Western Europe of American medium-range nuclear missiles.

In a bid to distract from Washington the indignation of the world public with the U.S. militaristic policy, the Beijing leaders and the press are trying in every way to lay the entire responsibility for the arms race on the Soviet Union. In Beijing they are intensively spreading the myth of "a Soviet military threat", which allegedly hangs over West European states, of some "USSR's military superiority in Europe," "the striving of Moscow," using negotiations on limitation of troops and armaments in Europe, "to conceal its buildup of armed forces" on the continent.

They in Beijing qualify the Soviet peace initiatives aimed at limiting and ending the arms race in Europe, as allegedly aimed at "sowing strife between the United States and West European countries," at driving a wedge into NATO and annulling the 'dual' decision of that bloc on deployment of nuclear missiles in Western Europe. Contrary to the fact of the existing approximate military strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States, which is recognized in Europe and even in the United States, they in Beijing assert that these Soviet initiatives are called upon "to preserve and even broaden the USSR's military superiority in Europe."

The Beijing press strongly attacks "pacifists" and "neutralists" in Western Europe those who are pressing not for the buildup but for reduction of the armaments of NATO and of the Warsaw Treaty organisation, on a mutual basis.

Denouncing the actions of protest of the world, particularly West European, public against the U.S. militaristic plans the Beijing press cites one by one pronouncements of those American and NATO leaders who advocate Western military superiority over the Soviet Union, who advocate escalation of the arms race.

Western countries "believe, as before, that the topical task facing them remains to build up defences to retaliate a Soviet military threat," the XINHUA asserts. "The neutron weapon consolidates Western positions at negotiations with the USSR," the RENMIN RIBAO echoes.

One should not take in earnest the allegations of the Chinese propaganda organs pertaining Western countries' negotiations with the USSR. It is not negotiations on limitation of the arms race, that they in Beijing desire. China's line, in questions of war and peace, specifically in questions of European security remains as instigative as it was at the Mao Zedong time--to set the United States and the USSR, NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries against each other, expecting that they will exterminate each other in a devastating nuclear war, while leaving Beijing as the absolute ruler of the destinies of mankind.

Pronouncements in the Beijing press on questions pertaining to the destinies of peace provide yet another proof for the fact that Beijing, as before, stakes on war.

'PROVOCATIVE' PRC POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA SCORED

PM261134 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Aug 81 p 5

[B. Barakhta's "International Notes": "Beijing Dissatisfied"]

[Text] The manifest failure of the recent so-called international conference on Kampuchea has made many people take a sober look at the situation in Southeast Asia and the dangerous policy being pursued in the region by Mao's successors.

It was clear from the outset that the conference's backstage bosses were prompted by neither concern for the fate of the long-suffering Khmer people nor a desire to relax the atmosphere in this part of the world nor, of course, by a sincere wish to help the victims of genocide. The Chinese delegation unambiguously set out to gain international support for reinstating Pol Pot's bloody regime in Kampuchea and to make that country a springboard for its own expansionist adventures. As was to be expected, this ruse failed.

The PRC mass media are fulminating against Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. Beijing is stepping up its armed provocations and subversive activities against these sovereign states. China's leaders themselves have also joined in the malicious campaign against the three Indochina countries.

This was one of the main reasons for PRC State Council Premier Zhao Ziyang's tour of the ASEAN countries, during which the Chinese leadership tried to perform its strategic task of fomenting hostility toward the USSR and the SRV, forcing its views on international problems on the public of the states in the region and lulling its legitimate concern regarding the threat of great-Han expansionism.

According to the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO the threat to peace and stability in the region is to be found not in China but in Moscow and Hanoi. Apparently "the main conflict in Southeast Asia is the confrontation between China, the ASEAN countries, Japan, the United States, Australia and New Zealand and the USSR and SRV." This is how Beijing perceives the disposition of forces in the region and it is trying by hook or by crook to harness its recalcitrant partners to its hegemonist chariot.

Beijing is trying to dictate to other countries how to conduct their relations with Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. A lard line should be taken with Hanoi, RENMIN RIBAO argues, and Vietnam should be fought "tooth and nail" and made to capitulate. If not, the newspaper warns, the ASEAN countries will be unable to avoid a war.

The consistently peace-loving policy of the three Indochina countries has been a blow to the Beijing ruling clique's imperial pretensions. In this regard it is no coincidence that the Chinese press is fiercely attacking the constructive proposal by Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea that the whole of Southeast Asia be made a zone of peace and stability. This initiative is in the interests of all the countries in the region. But it does not suit the great-Han expansionists. It is Beijing's hegemonist ambitions, supported by U.S. imperialism, which are preventing the peoples of Indochina from quietly going about their own business.

JAPANESE DEFENSE 'WHITE BOOK' RECOMMENDATIONS HIT

PM260858 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Aug 81 p 5

[Report by correspondent Yu. Vdovin: "Sharp Protests"]

[Text] Tokyo, 17 Aug--The Japanese military is attempting increasingly vigorously to influence the country's foreign and domestic policy in order to subordinate it to the fulfillment of its plans. The contents of the "White Book" prepared by the Defense Agency and approved at a cabinet session testify to this. This document contains an assessment by the military department, of the world situation, tasks and directions for increasing Japan's own military might and strengthening the military alliance with the United States and also certain ideas regarding the creation in the country of an atmosphere appropriate to supporting these efforts and neutralizing antiwar sentiments.

A central theme in the book is the myth of the "growth of the Soviet military threat," which has been widely utilized by its authors in the past to justify the country's forced militarization and was now necessary also in order to attempt to explain the sharp shift to the right by government policy in the last year. However, whereas in the past these arguments laid stress on preparing for the repelling of an "invasion" of Japanese territory, now for the first time the idea of striking at the "enemy" beyond the country's borders has been advanced openly. With this aim the navy and air force are being boosted and it is proposed not only to increase their own military might and cooperation with the United States on the basis of the "security treaty" but also to organize links with the NATO countries.

Sensing that such a course will evoke a new increase in antiwar feeling in the country, the book's authors draw attention much more than in the past to questions of the neutralization of such feelings and for the first time set the task of "instilling real patriotism." They describe as "senseless" ane "subjective" the warnings that the buildup of its own military might could draw Japan into a military conflict against its will. They also condemn those who call for complete disarmament.

The "White Book" has provoked sharp protests throughout the country. The opposition parties and democratic organizations assess it as evidence of Japan's further involvement in the Pentagon's aggressive strategy and as an attempt to accustom the people to the idea of the inevitability of war.

JAPANESE CLAIMS TO 'NORTHERN TERRITORIES' REBUFFED

PM270853 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Aug 81 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by M. Demchenko from V. Kondrashov's feature "World Today": "A Futile Venture"]

[Text] Judging by reports from Tokyo, Japan has recently been trying again to launch a campaign in connection with the so-called "problem of the northern territories" by which they mean the islands in the Kuril chain which belong to the Soviet Union. This time, as before, the Japanese Government and the ruling Liberal Democratic Party are setting the tone in the campaign of illegal Japanese territorial claims against the USSR. They have outlined a number of measures at various levels. In particular, they plan to hold a "people's rally for the return of the 'northern territories'" in the Japanese capital in early Setpember.

The purpose of all this is to sow distrust of the Soviet Union in Japan and to kindle revanchist sentiments.

Undoubtedly these actions have a quite definite aim--to distract the Japanese people's attention from the Liberal Democratic government's policy of militarizing the country and to "justify" to the public measures to build up Japan's military potential and the aggressive essence of the Japanese-American military alliance. As this alliance develops, Washington is trying harder and harder to push Tokyo onto the path of military preparations and is provoking the fueling of hysteria in Japan over the fictitious "Soviet threat."

As is known, no one is threatened by the Soviet Union and that includes Japan. The Soviet Union has consistently been and still is an advocate of all-round, mutually advantageous development of trade and economic, cultural and other relations with all countries. As for attempts by certain circles in Japan to involve the Japanese public in the so-called movement for the return of the "northern territories," they play into the hands of the opponents of genuine goodneighborliness and friendship between the Soviet and Japanese peoples.

The unfounded character of Japan's claims to the islands in the Kuril chain, which are an inalienable part of Soviet territory, has been explained in detail to the Japanese Government by the Soviet side. There is no territorial issue between the USSR and Japan. As is known, the Kuril Islands were returned to the Soviet Union after the defeat of Japanese militarism in World War II in full accordance with the Cairo declaration and other joint decisions by the allies who fought against fascist Germany and militarist Japan. These decisions were confirmed by the 26 June 1945 Potsdam declaration, all of whose terms were unconditionally accepted by Japan in the act of surrender. Finally, in the 1951 San Francisco peace treaty, Japan renounced all rights, titles and claims to the Kuril Islands.

The Japanese ruling circles appear to be trying to ignore all these irrefutable historical facts. This is surely demonstrated by the Japanese Cabinet's recent absurd request to map publishers in the countries which signed the San Francisco peace treaty not to mark the islands in the southern part of the Kuril chain as USSR territory on their maps. Thus, by all appearances, the Japanese ruling circles are trying to ascribe an "international character" to their illegal territorial claims.

To this end Japanese embassies and Japan's other foreign missions are distributing all kinds of materials distorting the historical facts.

The organizers of the anti-Soviet ballyhoo ought to realize that all claims to USSR territory--rallies, trips by "agitation detachments," the "inspection of the northern territories" by the present prime minister, Z. Suzuki, planned for the first half of September, and so forth--are a futile venture.

Revanchist claims to other people's territory can only hinder the future development of Soviet-Japanese relations, normalized 25 years ago. The strengthening of good-neighborly relations between the Soviet Union and Japan is in the interest of both countries' peoples and the interests of security and peace in the Far East.

AFONIN VIEWS STATE OF JAPANESE-SOVIET RELATIONS

OW270341 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 0830 GMT 26 Aug 81

[Yuriy Afonin commentary: "Good Neighborliness Is in the Interest of Both Nations--the USSR and Japan"]

[Excerpts] This October marks the 25th anniversary of the restoration of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Japan. In the past 25 years, Soviet-Japanese relations have made remarkable progress in various areas. The potential for development, however, has not yet been exhausted.

Development in relations between the two countries has indeed been hampered artificially since the beginning of the 1980's. The USSR is not responsible for this, however.

Because of man-made barriers, Soviet-Japanese relations are virtually at a standstill in a number of areas. Needless to say, this situation is neither normal nor in the interests of the Soviet or Japanese people. The Soviet and Japanese peoples want to live in peace and amity, deepen their mutual understanding and cooperate with each other in strengthening world peace.

In Japan, whenever a person tries to explain the reason for the present state of relations with the USSR, which have become a matter of concern for many people, he often comes up with arguments of an artificial nature, citing developments in Afghanistan and Poland and the northern territory issue. All these things, however, are pretexts, not true reasons for the cooling-off in Soviet-Japanese relations.

The present state of relations between the Soviet Union and Japan is inseparably linked with the sudden change in the policies of the United States and some of its allies.

The United States is imposing on its allies a role that does not meet their national interests at all, but rather Washington's greedy aim. For instance, it frequently refers to Western Europe as a "theater of war" despite the fact that there is no war going on there. This indicates the U.S. scheme to make use of its West European allies in achieving its ambition for world domination. The United States assigns a similar role to Japan, which it considers the frontline of its defense in the Far East. It requires Japan to blockade international sea straits in its vicinity in the event of an emergency to keep the [words indistinct] fleet from entering the high seas. At a time when the Pentagon is publizing the strategy of simultaneous military action in several areas of the world, such emergencies can possibly occur in the Persian Gulf and other areas as a result of a U.S. military adventure, pushing Japan into a conflict with the Soviet Union for a reason which does not involve the Japanese People's interests.

The U.S. Government is pursuing a policy of furthering international tension against the interests of all nations. The USSR is in confrontation with this senseless policy by pursuing its policies to consolidate peace, promote detente and bring an end to the arms race.

The Soviet Union wants truly good-neighborly relations with Japan. This Soviet position was again manifested during the recent talks between General Secretary Brezhnev and Mongolian General Secretary Tsedenbal in the Crimea.

Good neighborliness is the most reliable way of developing Soviet-Japanese relations and it meets the interests of both nations without threatening a third nation. The Soviet Union is prepared to follow this path. What in the world is keeping Japan from doing the same?

U.S., UK SPURN AFGHAN PROPOSALS FOR TALKS

LD261236 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 26 Aug 81

[Text] The United States and Britain have responded negatively to the latest initiative of the Government of Afghanistan aimed at settling the situation around that country by political means. Official Washington and London claim that the government statement circulated in Kabul fails to contain anything new as compared with the proposal of 14 May 1980. In fact, however, the document contains a number of new important provisions. The Afghan Government has reaffirmed its readiness for talks with Pakistan and Iran and agreed to conduct such talks either on a bilateral or tripartite basis. It also agrees to the participation in the talks of the United Nations secretary general or his spokesman. The main purpose of such talks, the statement underlines, is to secure an end to the armed or any other interference in Afghanistan's affairs.

DRA PARTY CHIARMAN CITED ON AFGHAN PROPOSALS

LD261700 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 26 Aug 81

[Text] Kabul, 26 Aug, TASS--"A new statement by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan dated August 24, 1981 reflected the changes which had taken place in the region in the period since May 14, 1980 when the Afghan Government published a statement about the ways of settling relations with Iran and Pakistan, a TASS correspondent was told by the member of the Political Bureau of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the DRA, Soltan 'Ali Keshtmand who was speaking in a TASS interview. "A personal envoy of the United Nations secretary general visited Kabul and Islamabad since that time. And still the leadership of Pakistan resorts to new manoeuvres in order to justify their refusal to discuss bilateral problems on a realistic basis. We are ready to discuss any issue, which Pakistan and Iran deem necessary to discuss, on a bilateral, trilateral or multilateral basis."

Soltan 'Ali Keshtmand stressed that in his opinion, after the statement had been published there was no grounds for any side especially for Pakistan, to reject the idea of the talks under invented pretexts.

"A new element in the statement is our consent to the participation of the UN secretary general or his envoy in the talks", Soltan 'Ali Keshtmand said. "If any of our partners in the talks is not ready to hold them for some reason, meetings could go on on a bilateral basis with the other. The statement includes a broad range of alternatives and formulates certain principles of the talks which we believe to be fundamental, in other words, it reflects a flexible position of the Government of the Democratic republic of Afghanistan and now Pakistan and Iran will have to respond to Afghan proposals," Soltan 'Ali Keshtmand said in conclusion.

BREZHNEV, TIKHONOV GREET DRA LEADERS ON HOLIDAY

PM261026 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Aug 81 p 1

[Text] To Comrade Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee and chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council

To Comrade Soltan 'Ali Keshtmand, chairman of the DRA Council of Ministers

On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the USSR Council of Ministers and on our own behalf, we send the PDPA Central Committee, the DRA Revolutionary Council and Council of Ministers and the fraternal Afghan people and yourselves personally cordial congratulations on your national holiday--Independence Restoration Day.

The courageous Afghan people defended their independence over 60 years ago and thus made a substantial contribution to the struggle to abolish the system of colonial rule in Asia.

The young Soviet state led by Vladimir Ilich Lenin was the first country in the world to extend a hand of sincere friendship to the neighboring Afghan people and to lose no time in recognizing Afghanistan's independence and autonomy. In turn Afghanistan became the first state to officially recognize the republic of soviets. In this period important to both states a firm foundation of good-neighborly relations was laid between the two countries based on the principles of equal rights, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, and mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity. The time which has elapsed since then has convincingly shown that these relations accord with our peoples' fundamental interests.

With the victory of the April revolution in Afghanistan, carried out by the Afghan people under the PDPA's leadership in 1978, Soviet-Afghan relations acquired the nature of international solidarity and fraternity. Broad opportunities were opened up for more fruitful Soviet-Afghan political, economic and cultural cooperation.

We wish the PDPA, the Revolutionary Council and the DRA Government and the heroic Afghan people and you personally, esteemed comrades, further successes in defending the gains of the April revolution, ensuring favorable conditions for the peaceful, contructive life of independent, Democratic Afghanistan, and the effective implementation of programs for the socioeconomic restructuring of Afghan society.

[Signed] L. Brezhnev N. Tikhonov

IZVESTIYA VIEWS SITUATION IN HERAT PROVINCE

PM261249 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 21 August 1981 in its morning edition carries on page 5 a 1,000-word dispatch entitled "Under Herat Skies" by correspondent M. Rostarchuk on life and recent events in Afghanistan's Herat Province. The writer describes how life in the city and province is "steadily getting back to normal" after the tense situation 6 months earlier when the rebels controlled the city. The day-to-day work of the province's governor is also described, with emphasis on the increasing trust shown by the population and its desire for an end to "lawlessness." The governor is quoted as attributing the increasing public trust in the authorities not just to the successes of the country's security forces but also to the "enormous explanatory work in which party activists are engaged among the masses." The dispatch goes on to cite cases of rebels seeing the error or futility of their ways and collaborating instead with the authorities, arousing the fury of counterrevolutionary forces. Among rebels specifically named are Munir-Khan, former member of the Jami'at ulema organization, and a certain Khalil, who is said to have rid Herat of Kamaluddin, who was backed by the Jami'atn-e Eslami organization and claimed by it to have been the rebels' "commander in chief" in northwestern Afghanistan.

U.S. AID TO PAKISTAN CAUSING 'SERIOUS DISQUIET'

LD261100 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 26 Aug 81

[Text] A high-ranking U.S. delegation arrives in Islamabad this week for further talks on American military and economic aid to Pakistan. This was reported by officials in Washington. The United States intends to assign $3.75 billion to Pakistan. Two-thirds of this money will go to acquiring the latest weaponry, including F-16 fighter bombers and tanks. A considerable part of the money, as reported earlier, will be allocated to training and equipping gangs for sending later into Afghanistan. This arming of Pakistan is causing serious disquiet in the region.

MESSAGE, CELEBRATION MARK ROMANIA'S LIBERATION DAY

Brezhnev, Tikhonov Greeting

PM261436 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Aug 81 p 1

[Message from L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and N.A. Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the RCP, and Romanian Prime Minister Ilie Verdet on the occasion of the anniversary of the liberation of Romania from German occupation]

[Text] To Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, secretary general of the RCP and president of Romania, and Comrade Ilie Verdet, Romanian prime minister!

Esteemed comrades! On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the USSR Council of Ministers and all the Soviet people, we cordially congratulate the RCP Central Committee, the State Council and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania and the fraternal Romanian people, on the 37th anniversary of the liberation of Romania from the fascist yoke.

The deliverance of the Romanian people from fascism, which was the result of the decisive victories of the Soviet Army on the fronts of World War II, the defeat of the German fascist forces in the (Yarsko)-Kishinev operation, and the armed uprising carried out in these conditions under the leadership of the communists on 23 August 1944, laid the foundation for the building of a new life on Romanian soil.

In the years that have elapsed, the Romanian people led by the Communist Party, in close cooperation with the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries, have achieved great successes in socialist construction and transformed their homeland from a backward country into a modern industrial-agrarian state. The Soviet Union, true to the course toward strengthening friendship and brotherhood with the socialist countries that was confirmed by the 26th CPSU Congress, will continue to strive to develop all-round cooperation with the Socialist Republic of Romania, both on a bilateral basis and in the framework of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and CEMA.

Today, in conditions of the serious worsening of the international situation caused by the actions of the reactionary imperialist circles and their henchmen, the cohesion of the countries of the socialist community and their close interaction in the international arena serve as a reliable guarantee of the defense of peace and the security of the peoples, of the strengthening of the international positions of socialism.

On the national holiday of Romania, we wish the fraternal Romanian people new successes in socialist construction, in implementing the decisions of the 12th RCP Congress, and we express confidence that Soviet-Romanian relations will continue to develop and grow stronger in accordance with the treaty on friendship, cooperation and mutual aid and on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, in the interests of the peoples of our countries and of the cause of socialism and peace.

[Signed] L. Brezhnev N. Tikhonov

Moscow Meeting Held

PM260937 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Aug 81 p 4

[Text] TASS--The Romanian people's achievements are a clear example of the boundless potential of socialism and the result of fruitful cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries, above all the Soviet Union.

This was stressed on 20 August at a ceremonial meeting of representatives of Moscow working people devoted to the 37th anniversary of Romania's liberation from the fascist yoke.

The keynote speaker, G.G. Sotnikov, deputy chairman of the Soviet-Romanian Friendship Society Central Board and USSR deputy minister, noted that Romania's liberation from the fascist yoke as a result of the Soviet Army's decisive victories and the armed rising carried out in those conditions on 23 August 1944 opened a new era in its people's life--an era of true national and social rebirth.

T. Dudas, Romanian ambassador to the USSR, stressed in his speech that Socialist Romania, the RCP and the Romanian people attach special significance to friendship and multifaceted cooperation with the Soviet Union and the glorious CPSU. In this connection he noted that at the recent meeting between Comrades L.I. Brezhnev and N. Ceausescu in the Crimea, determination was once again expressed to extend and raise to a still higher level the relations between the RCP and the CPSU and between Romania and the Soviet Union.

The ambassador wished Soviet communists and all the Soviet people new achievements in implementing the 26th CPSU Congress decisions.

Taking part in the meeting were P.G. Gilashvili, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Z.N. Nuriyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; leaders of a number of ministries and departments; representatives of party, Soviet and public organizations; military leaders, and also a delegation of the Romanian Association for Ties of Friendship With the USSR.

TIKHONOV, VERDET ADDRESS EXHIBITION OPENING

Tikhonov Speech

PM260902 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Aug 81 p 4

[TASS report on speech delivered by N.A. Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at 21 August opening ceremony of the Romanian national exhibition in Moscow, under general headline: "Opening Ceremony of Romanian National Exhibition"]

[Text] On the instructions of the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government, he said, I cordially welcome you and all the Romanian comrades who have come here for the ceremonial opening of the Romanian national exhibition.

In a few days' time the fraternal Romanian people will be marking the 37th anniversary of their country's liberation from the fascist yoke. During the years of socialist building in Romania, historic changes have taken place. Like the other fraternal socialist countries, Romania has achieved noteworthy successes. Under the Communist Party's leadership the working people have carried out radical transformations in the country, put an end to exploitation and unemployment forever and secured social rights for themselves which are unattainable under capitalist conditions.

The peoples of the socialist countries, having embarked on the path of building a new life, have passed through the difficult years of the cold war and international tension, foisted on them by imperialism. Not only have they stood firm, they have set examples of dynamic development for the whole world to see and have achieved outstanding results in all spheres of social activity, drawing on the advantages of the socialist system, international mutual assistance and all-round cooperation and socialist integration.

The Romanian national exhibition reminds us of this yet again. It clearly shows the fruits of the creative labor of the Romanian people, who are building a developed socialist society.

The Soviet Union and Romania are bound by fraternal relations, consolidated by the treaty on friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance and by participation in the Warsaw Pact and CEMA. All this helps us to successfully resolve the tasks of socialist and communist building.

Our party's Central Committee constantly devotes great attention to the expansion of fruitful ties with Romania and the other socialist countries. This is indicated by the recent meetings between Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and the leaders of fraternal parties and states in the Crimea, including his meeting with Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu. These meetings have a tremendous influence on further strengthening our friendly relations and expanding equal, mutually advantageous cooperation.

In the current 5-year plan the volume of Soviet-Romanian trade is to be almost double that of the last 5-year plan. In both the Soviet Union and Romania major work is now underway to study the potential for further developing specialization and cooperation in various sectors of the two countries' industry. We can see considerable reserves here for deepening our cooperation. Our joint efforts are aimed at ensuring that the two countries' economic, scientific and technical ties take on new scope.

The socialist countries have much in common. At the same time each of them has its own peculiarities, its objective economic potential. Taking this into account, we seek a form of cooperation which accords fully with the interests of each country and of the community as a whole. This is one source of the vitality and strength of our friendship.

The line of harmoniously combining national and international interests is reflected in the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the congresses of fraternal communist and workers' parties in other countries.

We are confident that the Romanian national exhibition now opening will arouse lively interest among Soviet people and will promote the further deepening of relations of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Socialist Romania. I wish great success to the exhibition organizers and all the Romanian comrades who will be working here.

On the eve of Romania's national holiday, permit me, on behalf of our party's Central Committee and the Soviet Government, to convey to the fraternal Romanian people wishes for new successes in socialist building and in implementing the 12th RCP Congress decisions and to express confidence that Soviet-Romanian relations will continue to develop and strengthen in the interests of our countries' peoples and of the cause of socialism and peace.

Verdet Address

PM260901 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Aug 81 p 4

[TASS report on speech delivered by I. Verdet, member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee and Romanian prime minister, at 21 August opening ceremony of Romanian national exhibition in Moscow, under general headline: "Opening Ceremony of Romanian National Exhibition"]

[Text] We are especially happy to open the Romanian national exhibition in Moscow--this exhibition is a noteworthy event in the development of our economic cooperation, collaboration and cooperation [kooperirovaniya sotrudnichestva] in diverse spheres of socialist and communist building, he said.

I. Verdet conveyed cordial greetings from the RCP, its Central Committee and Comrade N. Ceausescu, the party's secretary general, to the CPSU, the CPSU Central Committee and Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, its general secretary.

He greeted N.A. Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other Soviet comrades.

Our exhibition, I. Verdet went on, is taking place on the eve of the celebrations of the 37th anniversary of Romania's liberation from the fascist yoke--an event of historical significance which opened up broad prospects for economic and social progress and socialist and communist building in Romania. This sublime event was accomplished in the conditions of the brilliant victories of the Soviet Army, which bore the brunt of the war, and also the victories of the other allied forces and the successes of the antifascist front.

Romanian-Soviet fraternity in arms and the friendship between our people, which is based on ancient traditions, reached a higher level in the new conditions, in the interests of socialist and communist building in the two countries and the cause of socialism and peace throughout the world.

At present all the Romanian people and our party and state are making efforts to fulfill the historic decisions of the 12th RCP Congress and to ensure the exemplary fulfillment of targets for the new 5-year plan. The exhibition, I. Verdet noted, reflects the successes achieved by the Romanian people under the leadership of their Communist Party in the 37 years of socialist building, the structural and qualitative changes which have taken place in all sectors of the Romanian economy and the decisive role of science in creating the material and technical basis of our society.

We attach particular significance to extending and deepening foreign economic ties. The meetings between Comrades N. Ceausescu and L.I. Brezhnev are of extraordinary significance for the development of cooperation and collaboration between our two countries. These meetings are exceptionally important for the further development of cooperation between Romania and the Soviet Union and for the opening of new horizons in the cause of fruitful economic cooperation and collaboration. The consistent nature of the dialogue between the leaders of our parties and countries and the essence of the talks reflect the firm friendship and mutual feelings of respect which link our people, who are moved by the common ideals of socialism and communism.

An indication of the high level and great scope of relations between our countries is the fact that the Soviet Union ranks first in Romania's foreign economic ties. As was stressed during the recent friendly meeting in the Crimea between Comrades Nicolae Ceausescu and Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, in the current 5-year plan trade turnover between our countries will double compared with 1976-80.

The directions of the expansion and improvement of our economic cooperation are defined by the long-term program through 1990. The development of economic ties and relations of multifaceted cooperation between our countries and also within CEMA, the speaker went on to say, is all the more necessary today, in the conditions of the world economic recession, when forces hostile to peace and cooperation between peoples are again reviving the specter of war and when the arms race is taking on an unprecedented scale, threatening peace and universal security.

As was stressed in the joint communique on the recent meeting between Comrades N. Ceausescu and L.I. Brezhnev in the Crimea, today paramount significance is attached to ending any conflicts between states, substituting talks for confrontation and resolving all contentious issues, however difficult they may be, exclusively by peaceful political means.

We are opposed to the deployment of new nuclear missiles on our continent or anywhere else in the world and to the production of the neutron bomb. We believe everything possible must be done to cut military spending and bring about disarament.

In conclusion, I. Verdet expressed profound gratitude to the Soviet Government for its wide support for the holding of the Romanian national exhibition in Moscow and for the warm, comradely atmosphere surrounding the Romanian Government delegation.

RCP DELEGATION TOURS LITHUANIA, VISITS FARMS

LD251044 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 20 Aug 81

[Text] The delegation of the Romanian Communist Party headed by the member of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee, Ion Cretu, have finished their 3-day visit of Lithuania. The visitors familiarized themselves with Lithuania; they visited farms. The delegation was received at the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

'EXTREMIST' SOLIDARITY LEADER RULEWSKI CRITICIZED

LD270006 Moscow in Polish to Poland 1800 GMT 26 Aug 81

[From "At a Sharp Angle" program]

[Text] As is known, in the accords signed last autumn between the representatives of the Polish Government and the striking enterprises the premise was accepted that the new trade union would act on the basis of the Polish Constitution. This means, above all, that they recognize the sociopolitical system existing in the country and the leading role of the PZPR in the society. It was also stressed there that the newly-formed trade unions would not carry out political activities.

The year that has passed since that time has shown that the Solidarity leadership constantly deviates from those principles. The experts and consultants, especially those from the Social Self-Defense Committee [KSS/KOR] and also the anarchosyndicalists remaining under their influence stubbornly strive to transform Solidarity into a mass political movement whose goal is to be the seizure of power. Kuron, the KSS/KOR leader, does not even hide it in his public speeches. He favors organizing the society in democratic institutions as foundations for a new political system. Kuron finds eager accompaniment among the leading activists of Solidarity.

The most rabid opponent of the people's power is the leader of the regional Bydgoszcz organization of Solidarity, Jan Rulewski. It must be stated that the activists of Rulewski's ilk show most clearly what kind of people are the so-called creeping counterrevolutionaries, whose pharisaic (?pretense) is to pose as the defenders of workers.

First of all, we shall state that for Rulewski the question what should be the character of activity of the trade union Solidarity has absolutely no meaning. Contrary to the accords signed a year ago, he declared without hesitation: We are not trade unions but a sociopolitical opposition movement in this country.

Rulewski is also a great specialist in spreading provocative rumors and prophesies. Here is one of his latest prognostications of this kind: The authorities will fall, and will fall soon.

Today it is worth recalling some facts from Rulewski's life to convincingly show once and for all, what is in fact the moral and social image of the representatives of Solidarity's extremist elite. We shall cite a few of these facts. Rulewski, expelled at one time from the Military Technical Academy for slandering Poland and the USSR, as well as the socialist system, and reduced to ranks, deserted the army and intended to flee the country. He was caught, brought to court and spent 4 years in prison. It was precisely to this unbalanced individual of a hysterical character, the man who deeply hates socialism, the man brought to the surface on the stormy waves of August 1980 that extreme elements in Solidarity entrusted the role of organizing the notorious events in Bydgoszcz--the events which literally pushed the country to the brink of political and economic catastrophy.

We have just mentioned that Rulewski was for a time a student at the Military Technical Academy. In this respect, it is worth bringing up a telling fact quoted in one of the programs of Moscow television.

From this telecast we shall read excerpts from the letter of Lieutenant General of Engineering Services of the Soviet Army [name indistinct]. The author of that letter writes that when he was serving in the Polish Army as commander of the Jaroslaw Dabrowski Military Technical Academy in Warsaw he twice had to deal with Rulewski. Asked what did he think of the death camps of Majdanek and Auschwitz, Rulewski shamefully replied that allegedly the Nazis had not organized any camps for the Poles, and that they were not liquidation camps but camps for reeducation through work of idlers, parasites, speculators and other antisocial elements. To the question how did he dare maintain such a thing, the reply was: My father participated personally in the construction of such camps. He never lied and was a worker of exceptional honesty. It is not true that Germans persecuted Poles. Honest and responsible workers were respected by Germans. Their work was valued and suitably paid. No less insolent was Rulewski's answer to the question why did he start his studies at the Military Technical Academy and choose the profession of officer of the Polish People's Army: In the future fight against communism, when the Polish nation will be ready for it, Rulewski declared, commanders will be the most needed people.

It is simply hard to believe how brazenly and aggressively the representatives of counter-revolution of the Rulewski kind behave. In some places they have begun compiling lists of the local party aktiv, enterprise managements, and even the workers of militia and security services. It is safe to think that they did not do it in order to safeguard their personal immunity. This is testified to by the thousands of leaflets distributed or stuck on the walls in Warsaw and other cities, aimed against the organs of public order; the leaflets containing threats and malicious cartoons. This is also testified by the telling signs [nader wymowne znaki] placed on the doors of communists apartments.

Adventurists ever more brazenly and cynically show to the working mass in Poland their true face. What kind of image they present can also be seen in particular from the example of Rulewski--political adventurer without a trace of moral principles, a man for whom even the martyrs of Nazi death camps are just idlers, parasites and speculators.

BULGARIAN OFFICIAL VIEWS LEADING ROLE OF BCP

PM251524 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 20 August publishes on page 4 a 1,700-word article by Pencho Kubadinski, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Bulgarian Fatherland Front National Council, under the headline "True Democracy." Kubadinski outlines the development of democracy in Bulgaria in recent decades and asserts that "today the Fatherland Front, Bulgarian trade unions, the Dimitrov Communist Youth Union, the Committee of Bulgarian Women, creative unions and other mass organizations play a tremendous role in involving the working people in the management of society." He goes on to discuss the role of this participation by working people, dwelling particularly on the composition and role of the Fatherland Front. After outlining the development of "socialist democracy," he notes that "one of the main guarantees of socialist democracy is the Communist Party's leading role in the life of society and the state," and that "any weakening of the Communist Party's leading role inevitably leads to deviation from the principles of socialist democracy."

COMMENTARY VIEWS ISRAELI-EGYPTIAN NEGOTIATIONS

LD252330 Moscow TASS in English 2132 GMT 25 Aug 81

[Andrey Ostalskiy commentary: "Pressure Growing Stronger"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 25 Aug, TASS--The Israeli ruling circles more openly demand new concessions from the Egyptian regime as a condition for resumption of negotiations on the so-called "administrative autonomy" for the Palestinians. The latest example of that is an interview ot Israel's radio by the foreign minister of that country Shamir. A few hours before his departure together with the Prime Minister Begin for Alexandria to meet the President of the Arab Republic of Egypt As-Sadat, he said that from Tel Aviv's viewpoint the meeting could be considered "a success" only if the "Israeli demands were satisfied." He also said that "one cannot deny the link existing between normalisation of Egyptian-Israeli relations, negotiations on autonomy and withdrawal of troops from the Sinai Peninsula."

In other words, Tel Aviv demands that Cairo should finally be subordinated of its diktat threatening otherwise with frustration of negotiations on autonomy and even with "difficulties" with respect to withdrawal of the Israeli occupation troops from part of the Egyptian territory, provided for by the Camp David agreements. In the past few days Israeli high-placed officials were accusing Egypt with irritation that it "had frozen" the notorious "normalisation" of bilateral relations.. To Tel Aviv it now seems insufficient that the As-Sadat regime recognized Israeli, refused from participating in the all-Arab struggle for liberation of the occupied lands, established with the aggressor diplomatic relations, opened the doors of Egypt for economic and ideological penetration of Zionists.

What the Israeli leaders demand now is full support for Tel Aviv's aggressive course in the Middle East. This is how one can assess Israel's clearly expressed discontent with the fact that Cairo did not dare to officially approve the Israeli bandit raid on the Iraqi nuclear research centre and the barbarous bombing of Beirut. Israel's recently-formed government, the most reactionary ever in the history of the country, believes that the time has come to intensify the campaign of blackmail and arms twisting with relation to Egypt. The insolence of Israeli "hawks" is attributed to unlimited support from the Reagan administration which proved its readiness to close its eyes to the Israeli piratic policy, both in the military and political sphere. For the Egyptian regime, which found itself fully dependent on Washington, there is no other way out but to follow the endless way of concessions.

AS-SADAT-BEGIN MEETING SEEN AS 'CONSPIRACY' STEP

LD262110 Moscow TASS in English 1707 GMT 26 Aug 81

[Text] Cairo, 26 Aug, TASS--A summit meeting of two parties to the joint Camp David deal--Egyptian President as-Sadat and Israeli Premier Begin--has ended in Alexandria. The meeting is regarded in the Arab world as another step in escalating the conspiracy directed against the Arab peoples, above all the Palestinian people. The evidence of this is the decision, taken by As-Sadat and Begin, to resume in September this year negotiations on the so-called "Palestinian autonomy", about which they announced at a joint press conference upon completion of the two-day meeting.

The initiative of resuming the negotiations which were stalled more than a year ago, belongs to the Israeli side. As before, Tel Aviv hopes to use the "autonomy" plan as a means of preventing realisation of the inalienable national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, primarily its right to have an independent state of its own. The idea of "Palestinian autonomy" was resolutely condemned by a majority of Arab countries and categorically turned down by the Palestinian Arabs as having nothing to do with their national aspirations. The Jordanian press points out in this connection that Israel seeks to further its own version of solution of the Palestinian problem without the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Arab Palestinian people.

AS-SADAT OFFERS TO BE 'U.S. GENDARME' IN REGION

PM?61351 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Aug 81 p 5

[TASS report: "An Obliging Partner"]

[Text] New York, 18 Aug--Doing its utmost to win the trust of the United States, Egypt has taken upon itself the functions of U.S. gendarme in the Near East. In an interview he gave to the U.S. newspaper the Philadelphia INQUIRER head of the Egyptian regime As-Sadat made no secret of the fact that he is preparing his country and his Armed Forces to perform "an important new role"--suppressing progressive forces in the region in order to please U.S. imperialism.

As-Sadat said that he is seeking a special place for Egypt in U.S. policy--the status of Washington's main military partner. The newspaper points out here that As-Sadat had set out the principles in accordance with which he plans to develop ties with the Reagan administration in a letter which he personally handed to the U.S. President during his recent official visit to the United States. Dwelling on a number of key points in this "policy message," As-Sadat pointed out that he had offered to let the United States use any military bases and installations on Egyptian territory without its prior approval. The Egyptian president made no secret of the fact that U.S. reconnaissance aircraft are already making regular flights from Egyptian Air Force bases.

BREZHNEV, AS-SADAT EXCHANGE ANNIVERSARY MESSAGES

LD131536 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT 13 Aug 81

[Text] Moscow 13 Aug, TASS--Leonid Brezhnev sent a message to President of the Arab Republic of Egypt Muhammad Anwar as-Sadat, expressing congratulations and wishes of prosperity to the friendly people of the Arab Republic of Egypt on the occasion of the anniversary of the Egyptian Revolution. In the reply messages, the President of the Arab Republic of Egypt expressed profound gratitude for the congratulation and conveyed the best wishes to the friendly peoples of the Soviet Union.

PRAVDA REPORTS ON ETHIOPIAN-LIBYAN COMMUNIQUE

PM261241 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Aug 81 p 5

[TASS Report: "To Promote Detente]

[Text] Addis Ababa, 24 Aug--Ethiopia and Libya have declared their allegiance to the cause of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, Zionism and racism and for the strengthening of world peace and democracy. In a joint communique published at the end of the official friendly visit here of Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, the sides urged all the world's peace-loving forces to promote the development of the detente process and its spread to all regions. Seeking world supremacy, the document points out, the United States has adopted a policy of escalating international tension. Ethiopia and Libya decisively condemned the Reagan administration's decision to begin the full-scale manufacture of neutron weapons.

The document expresses serious concern at imperialism's continuing interference in the internal affairs of African and Arab states and its increasing militarist activeness, in particular, in the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea and the Mediterranean. Sharp condemnation was leveled at the U.S. plans to use the so-called Rapid Deployment Force against developing countries, and also at the policy of the governments of Egypt, Somalia and Oman, which have made bases available to Washington for the deployment of this interventionist force. Ethiopia and Libya evaluated the recent incident involving Libyan aircraft as "an overt provocation and an act of international terrorism and piracy" on the part of the United States.

STATEMENT, REPORTS ON SOUTH AFRICA-ANGOLA CONFLICT

TASS Statement

LD261716 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 26 Aug 81

["TASS Statement"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Aug, TASS--The Republic of South Africa has again challenged independent Africa and the world community by pushing further its reckless policy of aggravating the situation in the south of the African Continent. South Africa's aggression is spearheaded against the People's Republic of Angola.

On August 24-25 South African troops intruded in a large force into Angola's southern areas. Aviation is also actively involved on South Africa's part in combat actions. There are casualties among Angolan civilians. Angolan troops are rebuffing the unprovoked aggression.

South Africa's bandit actions only be [as received] viewed as some other evidence of the attempts of the racist regime and imperialist forces, which back it, to prevent young African states, which stepped on the path of social transformations, from building a new life.

The true objectives of Pretoria's activities, whatever hypocritical and false pretexts are used to cover them up, are the suppression of the revolutionary gains of the Angolan people and the destabilisation of the progressive regime in that country.

It is perfectly clear that Pretoria's rulers would not have risked another venture if they had not been certain of their aggressive plans being supported by the forces of international imperialism and reaction.

TASS is authorised to state that the Soviet Union strongly denounces the armed invasion by the racist Pretoria regime of the People's Republic of Angola, with which the USSR has a treaty of friendship and cooperation, reiterates its solidarity with Angola, and demands an immediate end to the aggression and the withdrawal of the interventionists' troops from Angolan territory.

Angolan Message to Castro

LD261552 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 26 Aug 81

[Text] Luanda, 26 Aug, TASS--The People's Republic of Angola has again fallen victim to the armed forces of the Pretoria racists, amassed on Angola's border with Namibia and numbering over 45,000 troops. This is pointed out in a message sent by Jose Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola]-Labor Party and president of the People's Republic of Angola, to Fidel Castro Ruz, chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement. What all this amounts to is a serious act of provocation gravely engangering peace in the region and international security, the message stresses.

On August 23 the air force of the racist Republic of South Africa carried out reconnaissance flights over the areas of Njiva and the Alessandre port, while six Mirages and two Buccaneers attacked and destroyed the municipal office of the city of Cahama (200 kilometers within Angolan territory) and the agricultural commune Chibemba (300 kilometers within Angolan territory).

On August 24 new violations of Angolan air space were recorded, and two motorised columns of South African troops intruded into Angolan territory. One consists of 32 tanks and the other of 82 motor vehicles. Both columns supported by the air force advanced towards (Shangongo) and Cahama.

The first column clashed with the Armed Forces of Angola in the area of (Shangongo) (100 kilometers within Angolan territory), where fierce fighting has been going on up to now. At the same time the racist air force intensively bombarded the population centre of Changonga.

Having captured the populated locality of Catecero (150 kilometers within Angolan territory), the second column joined battle with troops of the Angolan Armed Forces.

The message stresses that the situation is grave and may escalate into a war with unpredictable consequences.

The People's Republic of Angola as a sovereign state and member of the United Nations will be compelled to resort to the means provided for by Article 51 of the U.N. Charter to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

In conclusion Jose Eduardo dos Santos asked Fidel Castro Ruz as chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement to take measures through the auspices of the competent international organizations and members of the Non-Aligned Movement to put an end to the incessant acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola.

U.S.-South African 'Alliance'

LD261500 Moscow TASS in English 1342 GMT 26 Aug 81

[By TASS news analyst Sergey Kulik]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Aug TASS--The racist authorities of South Africa have made another challenge to the international community by launching a new act of aggression against Angola on the eve of the special session of the U.N. General Assembly on Namibia. The unprecedented scope to this aggression shows that the purpose of the Pretoria regime is to crush the Namibian patriots in Angola and to impair SWAPO so as to provide conditions for a neocolonialist decision of Namibia's future. At the same time, as spokesman for the racist military establishment brazenly admit, South Africa seeks "to give a lesson" to Angola and therefore to all the progressive African forces advocating the just solution of the Namibian problem and opposed to imperialism and racism.

It is pointed out in a letter sent by Jose Eduardo dos Santos, president of the People's Republic of Angola, to U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim, that the activities of the South African aggressors pose a serious threat to peace in that part of Africa and to international security as a whole.

"A very grave situation has taken shape on the border, one which may erupt into war," the letter of the Angolan leader justly points out. "The consequences of this are hard to imagine".

However, it is easy to see that aggressive character of South African policy towards Angola and Pretoria's pointed disregard for the U.N. resolutions on giving independence to Namibia have become particularly marked since Reagan publicly characterised the racist regime as "a U.S. ally" and since relations between Washington and Pretoria began looking like of a military and political alliance directed against the progressive African forces. The imperialists' and racists' ultimate objective is the establishment in Namibia of a puppet government and the turning of the territory of that country into a bridgehead for provocations against the independent African countries, first foremost against People's Angola. That is why the United States and South Africa are jointly trying to neutralise the achievements of SWAPO, recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity as the only legitimate representative of the people of South-West Africa, while demanding large-scale recognition for the anti-Angolan "UNITA" terrorist gangs.

The illegitimate attempts of U.S. diplomacy to tie the Namibian settlement to the inclusion of the ringleaders of the UNITA gangs in the Angolan Government and to Angola's rejection of the internationalist aid of the USSR and Cuba amount to Washington's gross intervention in the affairs of the sovereign Angolan state. Even the Johannesburg-based SUNDAY TIMES has to admit that Washington and Pretoria need talk about the "Soviet and Cuban threat" in South Africa to carry out under this cover their own concerted activities on the South African subcontinent, primarily to seek by joint efforts the elimination of the Marxist regime in Luanda.

The dangerous schemes woven by the neocolonialist forces around the Namibia, with South Africa's latest aggression against Angola being their result, can only be thwarted if the racists immediately withdraw their troops from Namibia and if the problems of the country are settled in a just and democratic manner. Any neocolonialist decision on that country's future, one allowing the presence of South African troops on Namibian soil, will enable Pretoria to continue to use Namibia for its acts of aggression and subversive activities against its neighbours, and the imperialist circles, primarily the U.S. to instigate a dangerous seat of international tension in south-west Africa.

'War' Possible

LD261736 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 26 Aug 81

[Text] South African troops have intruded into Angola and are stepping up their aggression. Commentary is by (Vladimir Lizun):

The invading force has occupied a number of communities and is continuing its drive northwards. It is supported by fighter bombers and helicopter gunships. This is in fact a large-scale intervention and it threatens Angola's sovereignty and independence and regional peace and security. It may lead to war with consequences difficult to foresee.

South Africa's brazen actions are meeting with full support of Western powers, first of all the United States. President Reagan has openly said his government considers South Africa a friendly nation. Washington is going out of its way to satisfy the ambitions of the racist aggressor. American companies are supplying South African commandos with weapons and brand new transport vehicles, used on a large scale in acts of aggression against Angola. The White House has also had the congress remove all restrictions on military aid to anti-Angolan subversive groups which are on Pretoria's payroll.

The United States and other Western powers are supplementing their military aid to the racist regime with diplomatic support. The UN Security Council has in the past 2 years considered at least 10 armed incursions by the racists against Angola, Mozambique and Zambia but each time the United States and its NATO allies have prevented effective measures from being enforced against the aggressor. Pretoria's pirate raids are also encouraged by China. It gives lavish aid to the anti-Angolan group UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola], which acts in close collaboration with Pretoria.

The military aggression against Angola is politically motivated by the hands of the South African racists. Western powers and China are trying to hamper progressive social and economic reforms in Angola. They are also attempting to browbeat that country into giving up its support for the growing liberation movement in neighboring Namibia, illegally occupied by racist South Africa.

In a letter to the UN secretary general the Angolan president, Jose Eduardo dos Santos, urged him to use all his powers to help stop the acts of aggression against his country. The campaign of protest against Pretoria's brazen aggression is gaining momentum all over the world and Soviet people are most active in it.

KUZNETSOV RECEIVES ZAIRIAN PARLIAMENTARIANS 20 AUG

PM261000 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Aug 81 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Friendly Talks"]

[Text] On 20 August V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received at the Kremlin a delegation of the Legislative Council of the Republic of Zaire led by its speaker, Nzondomyo Adokpe Lingo.

V.V. Kuznetsov informed the Zairian parliamentarians about the implementation of the peace program adopted by the 26th CPSU Congress, and about the Soviet Union's new peace initiatives, proposed by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev. He stressed that the Soviet state's foreign policy course is aimed at resolving the basic issue of today--preserving peace throughout the world and averting the threat of thermonuclear war.

Soviet people, V.V. Kuznetsov said, have always been in solidarity with the struggle of the African peoples for freedom and independence and now resolutely advocate the elimination of the remnants of colonialism and racism on this continent and the peaceful development of Africa. The visit to the USSR by the delegation of the Legislative Council of Zaire, he noted, is important new feature in the development of Soviet-Zairian relations, which are being built on the principles of equality, mutual advantage, respect for national independence and sovereignty and noninterference in one another's internal affairs.

The parliamentary deputies, Nzondomyo Adokpe Lingo said, have come to the USSR to convey the sincere wish of the Zairian people to develop relations of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union. We are confident that this noble aim will be furthered by the visit of the delegation of the Legislative Council of Zaire. As for the impression left by the visit, the delegation leader said, they are unforgettable. We have seen and learned much that is new and interesting about the life of Soviet working people and familiarized ourselves with the USSR's great successes in communist building.

During the friendly talk they stressed the importance of stepping up the efforts of all countries' parliaments to guarantee lasting peace and develop international cooperation. In this connection the great significance of the appeal "To Parliaments and Peoples of the World" adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet was noted.

The following took part in the talks: A.P. Shitikov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union; V.V. Sakalauskas, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet; I.I. Marchuk, USSR amdassador to Zaire; other officials; and also Kabeya Mukeba, Zairian ambassador to the USSR.

BRIEFS

AID TO EQUATORIAL GUINEA--The Soviet Red Cross has decided to provide relief aid for the people of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea. Medicines and vaccines will be flown to the city of Malabo from the Soviet Union. [Text] [Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 19 Aug 81 LD]

CUBAN FOREIGN MINISTER PAYS 2-DAY VISIT TO MOSCOW

FL262345 Havana Domestic Service in Spanish 2300 GMT 26 Aug 81

[Text] Cuban Foreign Minister Isidoro Malmierca has made a 2-day [as heard] visit to Moscow on a technical stopover en route to the SRV. During his stay in the Soviet Union, the Cuban foreign minister was received by Georgiy Korniyenko and Igor Zemskov, Soviet deputy ministers of foreign affairs. The latter saw Malmierca off today at the Moscow airport.

The Cuban foreign minister was coming from the DPRK, where he held talks with his Korean counterpart, Ho Tam. It was noted at the talks that the complex international situation demands the strengthening of solidarity among socialist countries and of all anti-imperialist forces, and a broadening of the struggle against aggression and war.

The two sides pointed to the dangerous increase of U.S. aggressiveness and condemned the provocative naval maneuvers in various parts of the world, including those against the DPRK and Cuba.

MEXICO'S ECHEVERRIA CONCLUDES VISIT TO MOSCOW

FL241217 Mexico City NOTIMEX in Spanish 0215 GMT 23 Aug 81

[Text] Moscow, 22 Aug (NOTIMEX)--Former Mexican President Luis Echeverria, who today concluded a visit [to the Soviet Union] at the invitation of the Latin American Studies Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, termed "very positive" his conversations with Soviet scholars on Latin American problems, and noted that he had invited some of them to participate in a seminar taking place in Mexico next month.

The former president, who visited the USSR as director of the Third World Center of Economic and Social Studies (CEESTEM), headquartered in the Mexican capital, praised the desire of Soviet experts to improve their knowledge of the Latin American reality, particularly the study of Mexico as an essential factor in the region's development.

Echeverria, who during his stay in Moscow held talks with Yuriy Ovchinnikov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, on Sunday will travel to North Korea where he will address a seminar on agricultural development problems. Subsequently, he will lecture in Belgrade on the problems of the world situation and on disarmament and nuclear arms in Calgary, Canada.

CPSU OFFICIAL LEAVES FOR GUYANA PARTY CONGRESS

PM251536 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Aug 81 p 4

[TASS report: "Trip to the Congress"]

[Text] CPSU representative P.A. Smolskiy, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational Party Work Department, left for Georgetown 19 August at the invitation of the leadership of Guyana's ruling party, the People's National Congress, to take part in the party's fourth congress.

DOLGIKH, ZIMYANIN ATTEND MEDIA LEADERS CONFERENCE

LD261526 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 26 Aug 81

[Text] A conference of leaders of central newspapers, magazines, publishing houses and news agencies, television and radio and of ideological institutions was held at the CPSU Central Committee. An examination was made of the activity of mass information and propaganda media connected with the fulfillment of the decisions of the 26th party congress and the instructions of Comrade Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on economizing and thriftiness in the national economy, and of the decision of the CPSU Central Committee on intensifying work on economizing and rational utilization of raw materials, fuel, energy and other resources.

A report was delivered by Dolgikh, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Taking part in the work of the conference was Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

It was noted that a movement has been started by working people for all-round economizing in industry, agriculture, transport, construction and the nonproductive sector. Stress was laid on the need to increase efforts in the mass information and propaganda media in mobilizing the working people to a more complete and efficient utilization of resources.

One of the most important tasks of the press is to spread profoundly and in a businesslike manner the positive experience of front-ranking collectives in saving raw and other materials, fuel and energy, to disclose reserves in production, sharply and in an organized manner to publicize instances of waste and extravagance, to imbue a concerned attitude to the national wealth.

REPORT ON SHEVARDNADZE INTERVIEW ON MORALITY

LD261700 Moscow in Hungarian to Hungary 1700 GMT 25 Aug 81

["Summary" of interview with Eduard Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Politburo and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Georgian CP, by unidentified reporter from MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI--read by announcer]

[Text] Our enemies, the reporter said to Eduard Shevardnadze, often interpret the communists' approach to morality from the point of view of class as a general denial of morality itself. They claim that communists act on the basis of the principle that the end justifies the means. What is (?your view) about this?

Our communist moral categories are substantially different from the moral categories accepted in bourgeois society, Eduard Shevardnadze said. For instance, we consider the exploitation of man; social, racial and national inequality; speculation, usury and irresponsible advertisements--that is to say a great deal of what is the everyday norm in the capitalist world--as immoral. Incidentally, the class character of morality is manifested in this; it is all moral despite the fact that there are general human characteristics in all these. [sentence as heard]. The communists' main goal is to ensure the prosperity of the people, the improvement of their standard of living and the free and harmonious development of every member of society. There is not, and there cannot be, a loftier moral objective than this. It is taken for granted that no progress can be made toward this goal by using immoral means which, of necessity, harm the individual. This is our solid principle; whoever violates this and resorts to immoral means puts himself outside the Communist Party Eduard Shevardnadze said. We are implacably opposed to these people.

No one is perfect; everyone has some defects. In your view, which moral qualities should characterize a communist? What are the defects that cannot be tolerated? This was our reporter's next question.

Indeed, all people are different. However, there are qualities that must be found in every communist, whether he is an ordinary worker or a leader. I am thinking in terms of loyalty to the ideals of communism, honesty, tact in dealings with other people, professional knowledge, and organizational ability. It is the duty of a communist, as it is said in our country, to be a political man who thinks on the scale of the state. This means that he should know how to inform his environment about the objective and meaning of the policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state. He must put the interests of all the people [words indistinct] above individual interests. I hope it is understandable, Shevardnadze noted, that communist morality requires on the part of every man goodness, love of work, loyalty and helpfullness toward others.

The qualities listed here include some that are also professed by the Bible, the reporter noted.

There is nothing strange in this, Eduard Shevardnadze answers. Nothing can come out of nothing. Religious morality is itself no more than a phase--although it is an important phase--in the history of morality. There are eternal and universal human values in it. There are also matters in it that serve only the interests of the ruling, exploiting class. Our communist morality was not created in a vacuum; it has gathered in itself all the best that has been worked out by mankind. Naturally, we do not reject universal, general human values. However, we communists have further developed and supplemented them with concepts such as an active standpoint taken in life, conscientious work for the benefit of all members of society, mutual comradely help, Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism.

The MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI reporter called attention to the fact that Eduard Shevardnadze has stated on more than one occasion that there was a reciprocal relationship between theoretical political education, the moral atmosphere of society and economic achievements. The reporter asked him to explain the mechanism of this reciprocal relationship using (?Georgia) as an example.

[Answer] At the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of Georgia, Eduard Shevardnadze said, we were forced to admit that the republic had been left substantially behind the national average indicators of economic development. There were no objective reasons for this. First and foremost, the bad socioeconomic results reflected the fact that the principles of socialist management had been violated and that the standard of educational work had been poor. We reached the conclusion that a moral atmosphere had been established in Georgia that was unfavorable in many respects. People had stopped seeing clearly the purpose for which they were working because our republic's pace of economic development at that time did not make it possible to satisfy a whole series of their requirements. There has been a substantial decrease in Georgia's backwardness in the past 5 years. We will (?bring it to an end) during the decade that has just begun. I believe that the dynamo behind this turn for the better is the reassertion of respect for the true moral values of socialism. It was, above all, (?respect for) conscientious work performed for the benefit of the common good, trust for one another, and respect for creatively thinking people who take the initiative that made it possible for us to uncover and utilize those enormous internal reserves that had not been exploited earlier. Shevardnadze mentioned as an example the (?Abbash) district in the Republic of Georgia where radical changes had taken place (?in a very time) and which had changed from being one of the most backward districts of the republic to being one of the best in the USSR. The yield in corn, which is the main crop, increased fivefold. The district became the training field for economic experiments, the significance of which is important for (?the leaders) of every republic.

The Communist Party of Georgia has become more active in the struggle against a whole series of negative social phenomena in the past few years. This includes the psychology of private property. Citizens' work is the only source of our social treasure.

On the basis of socialist principles, everyone receives products in accordance with the social value of their work. If a person takes more than he gives, then someone else will not receive his full share. This is a simple and irrefutable piece of logic. I would like to stress once again, Shevardnadze said, that I am not talking about people who earn a lot. We salute them; however, I am thinking of those who expropriate in some form the results of other people's labor.

The reporter asked: What do you consider important in this struggle? Is it the punishment of the guilty or rather the publicizing of positive examples?

Naturally, the most important point is the dissemination of positive examples. However, let me note that this is a unified process. How could one solidly establish positive examples if one were to tolerate serious violations of regulations?

The quality of work has a moral as well as an economic aspect, the reporter said. Which is the more important in your view?

I believe that there is no point in opposing these two aspects. Bad work and a bad product amount to economic and moral loss at one and the same time. No one wants a product of poor quality. It is not wanted by Georgia, by our fraternal republics, nor by our foreign trade partners. We are wasting time and raw materials when we make bad products because we do not fulfill people's expectations. One-fourth of all consumer products made in the republic 5 years ago was not of adequate quality. Today the situation is incomparably better, Eduard Shevardnadze said.

Rustaveli, the great Georgian poet, said eight centuries ago: "Evil is only temporary in this world, only good is eternal" [passage indistinct].

I believe in the triumph of good, Shevardnadze said, be it on the scale of our republic or on a world scale. It is the duty of a communist to be a good man and to teach others to be the same. Whenever we severely criticize someone--or even expel someone from the party or relieve someone of his post--then we are struggling for the man himself, for his human characteristics, and not against him. Let us be realists; we are still far from the complete triumph of good. It can only be reached as a result of the unified efforts of good and honest men. [Word indistinct] people are not as active, resolute and united as their opposites. The truth of this was declared by the immortal Lev Tolstoy.

In conclusion, Shevardnadze said, let me quote Nodar Dumbadze, a contemporary Georgian poet, who said "A man's soul is a hundred times as heavy as his body; it is so heavy that one man is incapable of carrying it. Therefore, all people have a duty to help one another and strive to make each other's souls eternal. You carry my soul, I carry yours, a third person carries someone else's and so on until eternity. In this way, one man's death should not condemn us to solitude in life." Therefore, everyone has to act in this way.

Dear Listeners, you have listened to an interview with Eduard Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Politburo.

UKRAINIAN LITERATURE MAGAZINE TO BE PUBLISHED

LD241636 Kiev in English to Europe 1900 GMT 9 Aug 81

[Summary] The Radyanskyy Pysmennyk Publishing House will be printing a magazine, UKRAINIAN LITERATURE TODAY, to popularize present-day Ukrainian Soviet literature abroad. It will include critical literary essays and interviews with poets and writers of the Ukraine. Next year the publication of books in foreign languages in the Ukraine will be broadened. The list will include many works by Ukrainian classics in translations.

CSA REVIEWS FODDER PROCUREMENT STATISTICS

PM261235 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 21 Aug 81 p 1

[Livestock specialist M. Glinka's "Agricultural Review": "Reliable Backup Services for the Shock Front"]

[Excerpts] According to data from the USSR Central Statistical Administration, by 17 August sown and natural grasses had been cut on 71.4 million hectares, including nearly 59 million hectares of hay and haylage. The country's farms have procured 54.9 million tons of hay, 50.9 million tons of haylage and 44.4 million tons of straw, chaff and other coarse fodder. Some 22.1 million tons of silage have been obtained and 5.1 million tons of artificially dried green fodder produced, including 4.4 million tons of grass meal.

Although more of all fodder except haylage and silage has been procured than by the same date last year (nearly one-fourth more hay and more than 50 percent more straw), this cannot be regarded as reassuring. The rate of procurement remains lower than last year and the advantage so far gained could easily be lost. The intensive work in the meadows and fodder fields must not be relaxed for a single day, so as to lay in as much coarse and succulent fodder as possible. Nor can fulfillment of plans for stockpiling fodder be regarded as grounds for slackening the pace of procurement operations. In a number of regions of the country the fodder crop harvest has not been a success and concern must be displayed not only for one's own herd but for helping other farms with fodder.

In this connection the example set by a number of oblasts in the Ukraine which have procured the planned quantity of hay but have not stopped haymaking merits the broadest support. The republic's farmers have already laid in 5.24 million tons of hay as against a planned 4.7 million tons and the target has been 111 percent fulfilled. Compared with last year, hay stocks have increased by more than 2 million tons, or 72 percent. The rural workers are continuing to stockpile fodder.

Farms in Moldavia and Kazakhstan have fulfilled hay procurement plans by 93-97 percent. In the RSFSR targets have already been met by the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Ivanovskaya, Kalininskaya, Kaluzhskaya, Kostromskaya, Moskovskaya, Tulskaya, Sverdlovskaya, Chelyabinskaya and Omskaya Oblasts. Georgian farmers are lagging behind, having procured less than one-third of the planned quantity of hay. Yet there is excellent herbage everywhere in the republic and in many regions there is every opportunity to create 2-year fodder stocks. This opportunity has been utilized skillfully, for instance, in Khashurskiy, Zestafonskiy, Mtskhetskiy and a number of other rayons, where they have already fulfilled or almost fulfilled plans for stockpiling coarse fodder. Yet alongside them there are rayons where less than one-tenth of the hay has been laid in. And in the republic as a whole less grass has been cut than by the same time last year.

Such contrasts, indicating shock labor by some and inefficiency by others, and revealing unutilized reserves, also exist elsewhere. Farmers in the Ukraine and Turkmenia are behind with laying in haylage, while Azerbaijan's kolkhozes and sovkhozes are behind with silage procurement. At the same time some farms can be found in each republic or oblast where the workers have been able to combat the unfavorable weather with good organization, skillful use of machinery and labor enthusiasm. In the current year it is particularly important to introduce widely in fodder procurement work the experience of frontrunners and the techniques and organizational methods they have developed.

In the current year's conditions it is particularly important to make full use of all initiatives aimed at reducing the expenditure of feed grain and utilizing it more economically and to introduce livestock raising techniques which make it possible to increase the animals' productivity while using fewer concentrates. This can be achieved above all if more bulk fodders are procured and their quality is improved. SELSKAYA ZHIZN has already described the experience of stockmen in Voronezhskaya, Kharkovskaya and Belgorodskaya Oblasts who make wider use of composite silage for fattening pigs. The other day the Gorkovskiy Obkom Bureau approved and recommended for wide introduction the experience of the Talyzinskiy and Bolshepolyanskiy Sovkhozes, which also make successful use of composite silage made from fodder root crops, sugar beet tops, the green matter from corn, straw from leguminous crops and waste from vegetable growing. In the current year these farms have decided to lay in at least 20 tons of such fodder for every productive sow. Many oblasts are extending procurement of such fodder. Tens of thousands of tons of composite silage have already been procured in Stavropolskiy Kray, Bashkirskaya ASSR and Kirovskaya Oblast.

Corn is providing good cobs this year even in zones where they do not usually ripen. They must all be harvested and stored safely. In Tambovskaya Oblast, with this end in view, all the sowings of early-ripening varieties of silage corn have been left for the harvesting of the cobs, which will replace a considerable quantity of mixed feed. In zones where this crop is usually grown only for silage there is no machinery for harvesting the cobs. The oblast's Komsomol organizations have come to the aid of the Tambovskaya Oblast farmers. Komsomol members from kolkhozes, sovkhozes, industrial enterprises and other organizations have pledged to harvest at least 100 kg of cobs per person--an example worthy of widespread dissemination.

In most parts of the country grain crops are being reaped. As well as grain, this yields considerable quantities of straw and chaff. All these must be efficiently gathered and sent to fodder storage. In many places this year's grain has not grown tall. It is all the more important to choose the correct harvesting techniques so as to gather in rapidly and without losses not only the grain but the nongrain part of the crop. In the Mordovskaya ASSR wide use is made of direct combining to this end. Odesskaya Oblast farmers have organized the mass laying in of "silage with a predominant straw content," as it is called there. In Penzenskaya Oblast they have decided to treat the stacked straw with ammonia. In Kirovskaya Oblast's Sovetskiy Rayon they are harvesting stubble for fodder too--the list of examples of such a thrifty attitude toward fodder procurement could be continued. But unfortunately there are different cases, too. Certain farms are slow in harvesting the nongrain part of the crop. A considerable gap between threshing and stacking has been permitted, in particular, in Kalininskaya, Smolenskaya and Volgogradskaya Oblasts and Altayskiy Kray.

RADIO REPORTS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 26 AUG

LD270400 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 26 August. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item:

In 1 month the people of Ryazanskaya Oblast have procured 10,000 tons of hay for public animal husbandry. (0200 GMT)

In Omskaya Oblast grain crops have been cut on 1.5 million hectares, which is two-thirds of the whole grain area. In Udmurtskaya ASSR sowing of winter crops is proceeding on the last few hectares. (0204 GMT)

Rye and wheat have been sown on nearly 400,000 hectares in Saratovskaya Oblast. Winter fallow is being plowed on the second million hectares in Orenburgskaya Oblast. (0400 GMT)

The winter crop sowing plan has been completed in Altayskiy Kray. Rye and winter wheat have been scattered on 185,000 hectares. (0600 GMT)

This year Stavropolskiy Kray supplied the country with 2.4 million tons of grain, 500,000 tons above plan. (0700 GMT)

Mass sowing of winter crops has begun in Lithuania. Nearly 500,000 hectares have been set aside for rye and wheat, which is significantly more than last year. (1200 GMT)

Primorskiy Kray's farmers are displaying stubbornness, skill and organization in their efforts to counter the bad weather. They are trying to reduce to a minimum the losses caused by the long rains and high water levels which have made the harvest extremely difficult. (1230 GMT)

Machine operators in Kazakhstan have put grain into swathes over half the grain area, which now covers 25 million hectares. Two-thirds of the cut grain has been threshed. (1300 GMT)

Mass harvesting of grain crops has started in Irkutskaya Oblast. Late ripening of the grain and continual rain have delayed the harvest's beginning. To carry out a speedy and high quality havest over an area of 800,000 hectares, headquarters have been formed everywhere to direct the work of the harvest transport complexes. Dagestanskaya ASSR's farms have to date prepared 1 million tons of coarse fodder. On many farms the fourth cutting of perennial grasses is in progress. It is planned to add 300,000 tons of grasses to the supplies of hay and haylage. In Turkmenia the planting of late vegetables has been completed: More than 1,700 hectares have been planted with seedlings, which is more than last year. In the zone of the 1,000-km Karakum Canal vast tracts are being brought under cultivation as market gardens. Sufficiency of water and the southern sun make it possible to obtain three vegetable harvests per season. This 5-year plan it has been decided to double the number of farms growing market garden produce. (1500 GMT)

The grainfield in Amurskaya Oblast, the Far East's main agricultural area, occupies 800,000 hectares. (2040 GMT)